DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 253 CS 505 583

AUTHOR Ulrich, Walter, Ed.
TITLE National Debate Tournament Booklet of Judges, 1987.
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 133p.; Statements from judges at the Annual National Debate Tournament (41st, Normal, IL, March 27-30, 1987). Best copy available. For a related document, see CS 505 584.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Competition; *Debate; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Judges; Oral Interpretation; Persuasive Discourse; Public Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *National Debate Tournament

ABSTRACT

A compilation of statements of the judging philosophies of the judges for the 1987 National Debate Tournament, this booklet presents the views of 132 college level coaches from institutions all across the country. The areas examined in the standard judge philosophy form include (1) personal preferences in regard to a decision making paradigm; (2) views on topicality; (3) preferred standard of competitiveness, or counterplans; (4) reactions to add-on, turnaround, and disco strategies; and (5) style and other issues (such as particular mannerisms coaches find objectionable). Where possible, philosophies of judges who did not submit a completed questionnaire in time for inclusion in this booklet were located from previous tournament booklets, and in these cases, the date of the judging statement is indicated. A list of the judges and their respective institutions is included. (AEW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED281253

BOOKLET OF JUDGES
41st ANNUAL
NATIONAL DEBATE TOURNAMENT

March 27-30, 1987
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

The following pages contain statements of the judging philosophies of the judges at the 1987 National Debate Tournament. In some cases the judging philosophies were unavailable at the time this booklet was prepared. If possible, judging philosophies for those judges that did not submit a judging philosophy in time for it to be included in this booklet were located from previous tournament booklets and have been included in this collection. When this was done, the date of the judging statement was indicated.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Walter Ulrich
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 583

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL DEBATE TOURNAMENT

BOOKLET OF JUDGES

1987

Edited by Walter Ulrich
Vanderbilt University

JUDGES AT THE 1987 NATIONAL DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Stephen K. Anderson	Augustana College, (Il)
Joan Archer	University of Kansas/Gonzaga
Kevin Baaske	California State - Los Angeles
Nick Backus	Texas A & M
Tim Baker	Macalester College
John Bart	Augustana College (SD)
Lynn Bearden	Weber State
Ben Bierman	Wayne State
Roger Biles	Southeastern Oklahoma
Becky Bjork	U. of Southern California
David L. Boman	Washburn University
Chuck Brody	Gustavus Adolphus (1986)
Brent Brossman	California State - Fullerton (1986)
Michael Bryant	West Georgia College
Tom Burkholder	University of Kansas
Nicholas F. Burnett	University of Pittsburgh
Kelly L. Burns	Wayne State University
John Burtis	Concordia College
Judy Butler	Emory University (1986)
Dane Butswinkas	George Mason University
B. Wayne Callaway	University of Wyoming
Ralph E. Carbone	Butler University
David Cheshier	Georgetown University
Alfred L. Cipriani	U.S. Naval Academy
Glen W. Clatterbuck	Miami University (Ohio)
Shelley Clubb	University of Louisville
Steve Combs	Claremont College (1984)
D. Douglas Cotton	Loyola Marymount University
Skip Coulter	Samford University
Earl Croasmun	Findlay College
Bruce Daniel	University of Kansas
Cori Dauber	Northwestern University
Scott Deatherage	Northwestern University
Warren D. Decker	George Mason University
Mark DeLoach	U. of Southern California
Stephen D. Dolley	University of North Carolina
Douglas Duke	Central State (Oklahoma)
Marie Dzuris	Ohio State University
Kathleen Edelmayer	Central Michigan
Rich Edwards	Georgia State University
Gregg Fishbein	Univ. of Northern Iowa
Lee Fitzpatrick	Mercer University
Keith D. Freadhoff	Univ. of Southern California (1986)
Jon P. Frenza	Wayne State University
Amy Fugate	Johnson County Community College
Paul Gaither	Houston Baptist University
Lenny Gale	Harvard University ***
Eric Gander	Northwestern University
Pat Ganer	Cypress College

Rey Garcia	Southwest Texas State University
Bob Garmon	Augustana College (SD)
Mededith Garmon	West Georgia
Robert H. Gass	Cal State Fullerton
Chester Gibson	West Georgia College
Keith T. Gilbert	Houston Baptist University
Robert Gilmore	Baylor University
John Gossett	North Texas State University
Glenn Graham	Bates College
Cecilia J. Graves	James Madison University
James Greenwood	Emory University
Edward Grinder	Saint Vincent
Frank Guliuzza	University of Notre Dame
Sherry Hall	Harvard/Univ. of Kentucky
Peter Hammer	University of Michigan
Scott Harris	University of Louisville
Pierre Heidrich	Weber State University
Bill Henderson	University of Northern Iowa
Dale Herbeck	Boston College
Keith Herron	Samford University
Ed Hinck	CSU-Fullerton (1986)
David B. Hingstman	Baylor University
Jeffrey Dale Hobbs	University of Kansas
Jodee Hobbs	University of Kansas
Tom Hollihan	Univ. of Southern California
John P. Jackson	Macalester College
Bill Jacobs	University of Iowa
Erick Jaffee	Dartmouth College
Shelley R. James	University of Massachusetts
Dale Jefferson	Houston Baptist University
James A. Johnson	Colorado College
Kamberleigh Johnston	George Mason University
John Katsulas	Boston College
Charles Kauffman	Northwestern University
Jack Kay	University of Nebraska
Randy Lake	Univ. of Southern California
Stephen G. Larson	Univ. of Southern California
Karla Leeper	University of Texas (Austin)
Allan Louden	Wake Forest University
Steve Mancuso	University of Michigan
Chris McMahon	University of Utah
Vince D. Meldrum	Arizona State University
Star A. Muir	University of Pittsburgh
Dennis J. Murphy	Marietta College
Bill Newnam	Emory University
Don Nichols	Odessa College
Jeremy Ofseyer	Harvard Law ***
Clark Olson	Arizona State University
Jeff Parcher	George Mason University
David Pelham	Central Michigan University
Dallas Perkins	Harvard College
Neil Phillips	University of Northern Iowa
Sharon Porter	University of Northern Arizona

David Rhasea	Dartmouth College
Jack Rhodes	Miami University (Ohio)
Dave Riek	Northern Arizona University
Pat Riley	Univ. of Southern California ***
Joel Rollins	Southern Methodist University
Robert Rowland	Baylor University
Marty Sadler	Houston Baptist University
Darrell W. Scott	Gonzaga University
Scott Segal	University of Texas
Taishen Siao	Wake Forest University
Doug Sigel	Dartmouth College/Texas (1986)
Bill Slagle	Mercer University
Ross Smith	Wake Forest University
David Snowball	Augustana College (Illinois)
Roger Solt	University of Kentucky
William Southworth	University of Redlands
Susan Stanfield	North Texas State Univ.
David Steinberg	George Mason University
Jenny L. Steinen	University of Pennsylvania
Fred Sternhagen	Concordia College
Ken Strange	Dartmouth College
David Svaldi	Adams State College (1986)
Ted W. Urban	Henry Ford Community College
Cary Voss	Baylor University
Melissa Wade	Emory University
Gregg Walker	University of Utah
John Wallen	Occidental College (1984)
Ron Wastyn	Wake Forest University
Mark Wayda	Ohio State University
Mike Weiss	Emory University ***
Joe Willmore	University of Massachusetts
Tod Woodbury	Wake Forest (1984)
George Ziegelmueller	Wayne State University
Bradley Ziff	Georgetown University (1986)

***No judging philosophy statement could be located for this judge; it is possible that this judge may bring along extra copies of his/her philosophy statement to the tournament.

1987 N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: _____ INSTITUTION: _____

POSITION: _____ YEARS OF COACHING: _____

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR: _____

1.) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM (Briefly outline your personal preference, e.g., Hypothesis Testing, Policy Making, critic of argument, etc., including the implications of these paradigms for individual rounds How do you react to theoretical arguments such as the "punishment paradigm"? Do you have minimum standards for argument? If so, what are these standards? To what extent do you "intervene" in the debate round to resolve arguments? How do you react to the popular types of disadvantages on this topic?)

2.) TOPICALITY (Are there any particular terms which you consider more relevant in this topic? How do you handle extratopicality arguments? How do you determine the "better" definition?)

3.) COUNTERPLANS (What standards of competitiveness do you prefer? How do you feel about permutation theory? Conditional counterplans? What topicality standards do you support? What do you do with topical counterplans? How do you react to the types of counterplans used on this topic? How do you feel about counterwarrants on this topic?)

4.) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO (How do you react to these strategies? What standards, if any, do you place on a team that uses these strategies? How do you react to a team that "discos"?)

5.) STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES (What particular manerisms, if any, do you find objectionable? Do you read evidence after the debate is over? What restrictions do you place on cross-examination? Areas such as evidence abuse, speed, etc. can be grouped here. How do you react to political movement/consciousness disadvantages? Is there any other advise you would give debaters debating in front of you? What, if anything, do you do to discourage incomprehensible speakers?)

Stephen K. Anderson
Assistant Director of Debate
Augustana College, IL
Number of Tournaments This Year: 5
Years of Coaching: 3
- -

Decision-Making Paradigm: I view debate as an academic game in which competing policy systems are compared and evaluated. There are certain rules to the game that are undebatable, including speech times, order of speaking, and the ethical use of evidence. Beyond these considerations, I will consider any argument that the debaters see fit to advance in the round. There is, however, a heirarchy of argumentation in which certain positions are more effective at winning my ballot than are others.

Topicality: Topicality is traditionally a voting issue, and I have always adhered to this tradition. I believe that an Affirmative team is responsible for initiating a discussion that falls within the scope of the resolution. I tend to give Affirmatives a heavy presumption on topicality, as long as there is a reasonable explanation as to why debatability is maintained. The characteristics of an acceptable definition include (1) grammatical consistency, and (2) fair division of ground. The Negative's burden is to illustrate why certain definitions of terms in the resolution are unacceptable, NOT necessarily why their own definition is "better" or "best." All words in the resolution are of equal importance, although I am not enthusiastic about listening to a 90-minute discussion about the word "should." I believe that the Affirmative has the right to sever extratopical plan provisions.

Counterplans: Counterplans are an extremely useful strategy, to the extent that they compete with the Affirmative plan. The best standards of competition are mutual exclusivity and net benefits. Conditional counterplans are presumed to be legitimate. Affirmative permutations are not required to be net topical, and I do not believe that the Affirmative can "capture" counterplan advantages since a permutation is only a hypothetical test of compatibility. Non-topicality of the counterplan is of far less importance than competition. Utopian counterplans (socialism, world government, anarchy, etc.) are rarely successful because most Negatives fail to quantify the advantages forfeited by coexistence with the plan. Counterwarrants are presumed to be unacceptable, because they shift the focus of the debate away from the plan, and thus violate the requirements of clash and debatability.

Other Items of Interest: Add-ons are fine. Turn-arounds to disads are voting issues. Cross-applications in rebuttals can be legitimate, but a good 2NR can persuade me otherwise. Radical departures from the original constructive position in 2AR are generally unacceptable. I will vote on big disads, to the extent that the Negative demonstrates a level of risk sufficient to outweigh the Affirmative advantage. Inherency is a joke. "Punishment" arguments and justification presses are rarely successful. Decision-rules are useful for magnifying the importance of certain issues, but are not independently voting issues. The documented misuse of evidence guarantees a loss and zero points. I will ask to see critical pieces of evidence after the round if I believe it to be necessary. Stylistic considerations: (1) rude and obnoxious debaters receive embarassingly low points, (2) speed is not a concern; clarity is, (3) well-developed and clearly explained arguments are always more effective than a large number of verb-less blips.

Joan Archer
University of Kansas
5 Years Experience
8 Tournaments

Topicality: This is not one of my favorite issues to hear in a round. I do not enjoy "standards" debates. I will vote on topicality, but this is usually when it has been well argued by the negative and poorly argued by the affirmative. I believe topicality is a voting issue.

Decision-Making Paradigm: I usually find my self involved in the typical process of weighing advantages versus disadvantages/counterplans, etc. However, I will use an alternate paradigm if it is defended and justified within a given round.

Standard of Significance: I will vote on cases with minimal significance. However, this year cases with any first amendment advantage seem to link to the generic first amendment disadvantages quite well. Hence, the small cases are often times easy to outweigh with disadvantages.

Evidence Standards: I place a high premium on evidence and the research processes involved in debate. Consequently, I base my decisions primarily on evidence in relation to the arguments made. I will evaluate the quality of the evidence in making my decision. The best evidence gives clear proof and clear reasons for the claims made. "Blip" evidence, evidence that seems to assume different issues or is apparently assuming an entirely different context is clearly inferior to specific, reason-giving evidence from good sources.

Counterplans: I am fairly liberal on counterplans and conditional arguments. Many counterplans seem to have topicality problems this year. Conditional arguments should not be inherently contradictory and a fairly consistent position should be presented in 2NR.

Misc., Style, Etc.: I am fairly liberal and flexible. However, I do not care for counter-warrants; add-ons, turnarounds, etc., are fine. However, 1AR needs to give some indication that what 2AR is likely to do. If 2AR seems too "new" I tend to consider whether 2NR could have anticipated the manuevers. Clarity of delivery is important. I am finding myself increasingly less tolerant of fast debaters who are unclear when they read evidence. Debaters should be both pleasant and professional.

KEVIN BAASKE
DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

CAL STATE LOS ANGELES
ELEVENTH YEAR

PARADIGM: I make an honest effort to evaluate the round on the criteria presented by the debaters, but that doesn't mean that all arguments are equally compelling. The following comments should help to clarify those which enjoy presumption. Generally. I look for analysis and explanation from debaters. I am unimpressed by the dumping of arguments, especially when they lack sufficient numeration. The advocate who provides a scenario with their argument, or indicates the flaw of a competing scenario is more likely to convince me than the advocate who simply pulls a card or tag. Making sense in and of the round is critical to winning my ballot.

TOPICALITY: Like many judges, I have grown more conservative with age. That doesn't mean I'll buy any T argument. I want developed argumentation. Explanation and examples are most useful. I especially dislike dumping little T arguments hoping for an aff to mishandle something. If you're going to run it, explain it. Similarly, aff's will enhance the likelihood of winning my ballot by explaining their topicality defense rather than attempting to win it by carrying some dropped tag on standards.

COUNTERPLANS: I think debaters overuse this strategy and neglect refutation of aff claims of sig and solvency, but there is nothing wrong with utilizing a counterplan when appropriate. Appropriateness is probably best determined at the policy level rather than the resolutional level. I believe, and usually enforce a standard of mutual exclusivity and/or net benefits. The former asks whether the plans <u>could</u> mutually coexist, the latter whether they <u>should.</u> Too many negatives label should not coexist arguments as could not. The net disadvantage to adopting both plans, e.g., aff entrenches capitalism, should be proved. I believe permutations can effectively illustrate that a counterplan is not mutually exclusive. And can locate the clash of the should not argumentation. I am not sympathetic to negatives who whine about permutations when they began the process by arguing a counterplan which doesn't clash at the policy level. But I generally don't end up allowing aff's to incorporate the permutation as part of their plan, and then use the modified plan to answer other issues. A topical counterplan is probably a warrant for the resolution.

STYLE: I rarely read evidence after a round, and then only if I feel I should have understood the evidence the first time. I think clarity is important. Speed is a not a problem, but clarity frequently is. So it is better to slow down and explain, than it is to risk my not following your argument. Especially this year when I have heard comparatively few rounds. If that makes me a buffalo, I can live with that. I just think it makes me a reasoning human being, rather than a machine.

Tim Baker-Macalester College. (23 Rounds this topic)

1) Topicality- T is always a voting issue and I consider it a priori. The affirmative has the right to choose ground in the debate but should not abuse the topic. If the affirmative defines the topic in such a way that it is clearly unfair to the negative or broadens the topic unjustifiably I will vote on T. Reasonableness is arguable in the round as well as the better definition. I don't buy topicality by and consider it a voter as well. Negatives should not abuse effects arguments though. Extra-topical is a voter as well and planks that are extra topical and accrue independent advantages absent the resolution I won't consider.

2) Counterplans- C-plans must be non-topical and competitive. Standards of competitivness can be abused. Resource, Philosophical etc. In a Hypo-testing paradigm I will accept hypothetical counterplans but think too many counterplans in a round can become abusive as well. Counterplans should always be run in the first negative.

3) Paradigm? If I had to label myself in a paradigm I would choose Stock-issues. I will vote on sig. Inher. Solv. T. or disads.

4) Disadvantages. I like specific disads with specific links. Generic disads I will vote for but links must be explained clearly. Risks of disads that are based on four or five links in order to get to impact I will vote on but it becomes much harder for the negative team. If affirmatives cry no link, little risk, I tend to listen.

5) Do's and Don's/
Style- Speed is acceptable but I don't vote on tag lines. If I don't hear it, I don't vote on it. If I don't understand an argument because of the way it is delivered I won't vote on it. I like humor in a round, and think that the debaters should be courteous to each other. Cross-ex involves two people the one asking and the one anwsering. I don't like partners feeding responses in cross-ex. 1ar responses are the responses 2ar must use. New arguments in rebuttals I don't even consider in my decision. Disads in 1nc are acceptable and 2n can pick up 1n arguments. I don't like to see 1n run eight disads and picking and choosing which ones aff. does not respond to. Disco can be abused. I like negs to take a position before 2nr.

6) Turns- I don't usually vote on turns because they are not explained. If I am going to vote for you because of one argument that happens to be a turn, it better be clearly explained and the impact it has in the round.

7) Finally, I really enjoy a debate round that the debaters pick and choose the issues for me. If you make me do all the work at the end of the round you have made a mistake because I could justify a ballot either way. Give me a package of what you have to offer, your stand in the round and weigh the issues for me.

Good luck to all.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

John Bart
Director of Forensics

Augustana College, SD
7 yrs./11 tournaments

1. PARADIGM: I prefer to see myself as an informed decision maker evaluating the merits of two competing policies. Some have called this the advocacy paradigm. The negative should provide a consistent policy that can be evaluated against the affirmative policy. There is no implementation at the end of the debate. I am deciding what would be a good idea based upon the arguments in the debate. While this is the view of preference, I am willing to operate in other paradigms provided the debaters articulate the rationale. If argumentation becomes conditional, the debaters should provide me with a clear path toward resolution of what happens when the debate ends. If this is not done, I will make the negative consistent. Leave things conditional without a course of action and I will do with it what I please. In order to vote on a position, I must understand it. As the years pass, there are more arguments that get thrown out due to lack of understanding. I am reading less evidence. I will look at a card if 1) it is contested 2) I fail to understand because of my error 3) there are two cards clashing and there is need for resolution of their quality. Theory arguments are fine. I prefer reason to debate theory cards that quote some one's conclusion. Debaters will be rewarded for explaining their positions and how they relate to the other side. I would prefer the debaters resolve the debate than be left to my own imagination.

2. TOPICALITY: The debate topic defines the jurisdiction for a given round and functions to define argumentative ground equally. The affirmative must meet all of the terms of the resolution and TOPICALITY IS ALWAYS A VOTING ISSUE. The topic must be large enough to provide the affirmative choice but narrow enough to leave adequate negative ground. Standards should be applied and explained. There are too many standards in debate and not enough application. Finally, the negative must provide me with an interpretation of the resolution rather than just telling me that the affirmative is not a part of it. This can be done by telling what cases would be topical.

3.COUNTERPLANS: I do not like government change counterplans. They are usually non-competitive and often topical. I prefer mutual exclusivity and net benefits. Permutations are a test of competition, thus need not be topical. The affirmative must explain the exact permutation it is making. I would prefer it if the numbers of permutations decreased and the quality increased. If it is truly a non-competitive portion of the counterplan it will probably only have one permutation. I am undecided on topical counterplans. I have really become disenchanted with numerous couterplans in a single debate. I find it makes debate a process of waiting for mistakes rather than evaluating and defending arguments. I prefer that counterplans remain in the debate. They are not like other issues because they are alternative policies that have implications on all of the other issues in the debate.

4. STYLE/DISCO: I do not like disco music. I do my best to keep a good flow. However, there are numerous times that I cannot write as fast as you can talk. Strategic choices are fine in the final rebuttal. I reserve the right to examine my flow for possible negative answers to 2ar magic. New arguments in rebuttals are a bad thing and are not evaluated. Until the 2ar it is the burden of the debaters to point these new things out. I will scrutinize 2ar but not the other three on my own. I will not tolerate debaters who swear, abuse opponents, abuse colleagues, or abuse judges. There is just no place for it in debate. You will be punished if I am offended. Finally, I do not like counter-warrants.

Lynn Bearden
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS 6

WEBER STATE COLLEGE
UNIV. OF UTAH SCHOOL OF LAW

TOPICALITY: T is usually a voting issue. I view it as a jurisdictional question. Topical counterplans may be reasons to vote Neg. Fairness is a consideration. Therefore, extra-T may be a voting issue. Standards should be applied to the terms or they are of little use in evaluation. The "better definition" standard means virtually nothing to me as a label. What is a better definition? Why is your definition better? Why is it better to limit a word to one meaning? All of these questions need to be answered under a "better definition" standard. Implications of a term being defined in one way rather than another are helpful. The nature of topicality requires more analysis than arguments elsewhere in the debate. I like good topicality debates, but this requires develpment of the arguments.

COUNTERPLANS: I like them. Mutual exclusivity is sufficient for competition, but usually not necessary. If the counterplan alone is better than the counterplan plus the Aff. it is competitive. However, to prove the counterplan is better alone, the negative must do more than prove some minimal risk of inconsistency when the Aff. has an additional and more concrete advantage. The word "permutations" is thrown around too much. Reasons why the Aff. advantage can topicality be achieved consistent with the counterplan position should be explained. I like conditionality, though it may be abused. If a conditional counterplan is disadvantageous, I would not vote for that alternative but other options are still considered. However, I don't think one side has the power to kick out evidence which supports an advantage to the other side. Evidentiary contradictions are bad for you because at the very least the evidence disproves itself. I hate counterwarrants.

DISADS: Links must be specific. I am not persuaded by DAs with big impacts and only some small risk of a link. Uniqueness is important, especially when a snowball effect is claimed. I buy intrinsicness answers, but only when some amount of depth is provided.

CASE: I like case arguments but I am not usually persuaded by inherensy or significance attacks. If the plan is not being done now, inherensy is satisfied. On this topic, the freedoms of one person are significant.

STYLE: I dislike obnoxiousness. Everyone should at least be cordial. You should at no time be hostile to your opponents or your partner. Speed is fine. Incomprehensibility is not fine. If you give several fast tag lines, I will probably miss some of them. I'm a little out of practice in flowing. Law professors seldom spew.

Ben Biermann
Wayne State University Years of coaching-1 #of tournaments-7

Decision making paradigm- My judging paradigm is as follows: I weigh the affirmative advantages against the negative disadvantages. The affirmative advantage can usually, of course, be minimized by the negative arguments, but rarely will the negative totally reduce the affirmative significance. Hence, disadvantages are important in my evaluation of the debate. If counterplans are advanced, I compare the two policies to determine the optimal policy in the debate. I rarely vote on punishment arguments, as they tend to be under-developed and a waste of time. For me, an argument consists of a tagline followed by a coherent explanation or a comprehensible piece of evidence. I hate it when debaters throw out 500 taglines and then start explaining two speeches later. This substantially reduces the credibility of the argument. I despise judge intervention and will never intervene in the round unless I am forced to by unclear rebuttalists. I will listen to and vote on any type of argument if it is unrefuted. I have no particular biases to certain disads etc.

Topicality - Yes, it is a voting issue. I have never heard a persuasive reason why it is not. Chances are that I never will. Extra-topicality may or may not be a voting issue, depending on how it is argued. I will listen to violations on any term in the resolution. The arguments must however, be clearly developed. Hence, if you decide to run 15 violations, chances are that they are not clearly developed.

Counterplans - Counterplans must be mutually exclusive and/or net-beneficial(and non-topical) I will listen to reasons why permutations are or are not legitimate but will ultimately let the debaters decide this issue. Conditional counterplans are legitimate. I do not think however that every argument advanced against the counterplan necessarily disappears when the counter plan is punted.

Add-on's TA's Disco's - All are fine, just give some indication that a disco is going to occur prior to the 2AR. It makes it more likely that I will not think you're [redacted] too greasy

Style etc- I will read evidence after rounds if necessary. I will flow every argument that I can comprehend. This means that I refuse to write down arguments that are stated in the CX, unless I feel that I missed a response because it was my fault. Hence, go for it! Argue anything that you want, as fast as you want. If you are incomprehensible, however, I take no responsibility for not flowing or not understanding an argument. (or for giving low speaker points). I sincerely believe that debate should be a fun activity so have fun, dont be mean in CX, and chances are that I will like listening to your arguments.

Judging Philosophy for Rodger Biles
Southeastern Oklahoma State Univ.

I believe that I would be considered a fairly traditional judge in that issues such as topicality, prima facie burdens and presumption carry a great deal of weight with me. Theoretical arguments are valid and I will readily accept them provided there is logic behind the theory, and that there is a legitimate reason to make the argument. Theoretical arguments that are made for the sole purpose of time allocation will be punished.

Counter plans are a legitimate form of argumentation, but I find that most teams that use them do so in order to avoid debating the affirmative case. I cannot vote for a counter plan. I can only vote for or against the resolution, therefore a topical counterplan forces me to vote for the resolution, which means I vote affirmative.

As far as types of arguments that I will accept (i.e growth is bad, etc.) I will buy anything that is backed by evidence with clear and present links. I also, however, resent hearing blocks of link evidence that is ten years old. Affirmative teams faced with such issues should realize that I readily buy a "real-world" standard on that type of argument.

Speed is not a problem, provided the debator can speak clearly at whatever pace he chooses. While I accept a "spread" as a legitimate tactic, teams choosing it need to realize that I feel an argument worth making is worth extending. Therefore, spreads made merely for the purpose of tying the other team's hands time wise, then not extended will be suitably punished.

I find little useful comes from the Cross-examination period and would like to be proved wrong. Most teams base very little argumentation on answers from c-x, and that is an unfortunate mistake.

One other comment on style, I do not tolerate "tag-team" debating, where one partner tells another what to say during c-x and speeches. Each participant gets two speeches and two c-x opportunities, and they are his to do with what he can.

Becky Bjork
Assistant Coach

University of Southern California
Four years coaching
10 Tournaments attended this year

Paradigm: I really don't have much of a preference when it comes to judging paradigms. Basically, it is up for debate; feel free to persuade me one way or another. However, if left to my own devices, I tend toward policy making; that is, weighing advantages, disadvantages and counterplan advantages. I do not have strong feelings about conditionality. However, I do not believe that conditionality allows debaters to run positions where there are direct evidentiary contradictions. You can argue about whether conditionality is good or bad in the debate round, and I have no problems with that. I will not vote on cheap shot "reverse voting issues" or "punishment" arguments. I do not believe that debate should be a forum for punishment.

Topicality: It IS a voting issue, please do not try to persuade me otherwise. I like a good topicality debate, with emphasis on the word "good." If you have a violation that makes sense, is consistent with legal interpretations of words, and is well argued, I consider that to be a good topicality argument. A bad topicality debate is one in which debaters blip through the violations at top speed, do not explain their arguments, and repeat tags from earlier speeches. (In fact, that is just plain bad debate, in my mind). I also think that too many topicality debates overemphasize standards. If you win a violation, I don't believe that the standards mean that much anyway. Please apply your standards to the violations; that is their function. Explain to me why, if you win standard X, you win the violation.

Counterplans: They are O.K. I prefer mutual exclusivity and net benefits as competition standards, but I may be persuaded that others are acceptable as well. Take advantage of extra-competition arguments if you are on the affirmative. Counterplans that claim an advantage from restricting all rights seem to me to be extra-competitive, unless the negative can persuade me otherwise. Although I will vote on counterplans, I prefer a debate where there is case specific evidence and good disads with links.

Add-ons, turnarounds and disco: I have no problems with these strategies. Please do not label everything a turn, and make sure they are clearly explained when argued. A warning about disco: if you wait until 2AR to make your big move, I will look back to 1AR argumentation for hints of this strategy. If I find none, and believe that 2NR had no chance to anticipate such a move, I will look for potential 3NR cross-applications. This is a tricky situation, and you must make sure you convince me that this is legitimate in 2AR. I do appreciate debaters who collapse down to 3 or 4 key issues in the last rebuttal.

Style: I do not appreciate group cross-ex. Please answer your own questions! I have no problems with speed, but comprehensibility is vital. If I cannot understand you, you will know it by looking for my reaction. I will not reconstruct the debate after it is over by reading all of the cards that were supposed to have been made clear in the debate by the debaters. I will examine certain key cards, but I will not read lots of evidence.

1985 Statement

Brent Brossmann
Graduate Assistant
9 Tournaments Judged at this Year

C.S.U., Fullerton
1 Year Coaching

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I try not to label myself, so I won't. There are certain burdens which I think affirmatives should meet, and these burdens come from several different paradigms. They are subject to debate, of course, but I believe that the affirmative case should be prima facia, that it should justify the wording of the resolution, and that the advantages should outweigh the disadvantages. By justification, I do not mean that the affirmative option must be superior to every conceivable option, but that the affirmative should be able to justify voting for their proposal within the specific guidelines established by the topic (language arts, mathematics, natural sciences). It is not enough to prove that your proposal <u>can</u> fit within the resolution, but the affirmative should prove that the case <u>belongs</u> within the resolution.

I try not to intervene in rounds, but this is hard to avoid if 2NR and 2AR do not weigh and analyze the voting issues. I would prefer not to make decisions, but would rather the debaters make the decisions for me (during the round). Although I do not like punishment arguments, I could vote on this issue if clearly won. I also do not like listening to one line blips. Arguments should be more than assertions - they should be supported either through evidence or analysis.

TOPICALITY: I think the limitation to three areas of education is a very significant part of this resolution. I do not know how to determine the "better" defintion, nor am I sure that a "better" definition is necessary - both positions are certainly debateable. I believe that topicality is a voting issue (also debateable). I will vote on topicality, but haven't often as few teams have been serious about this argument this year.

COUNTERPLANS: I like them. I think that counterplans should be a reason to reject the affirmative, not a "neat idea" that could be done in addition to the affirmative. Permutations seem to be a good test of competition. The standards for topicality of the counterplan should be the same standards used to evaluate the affirmative. Although I am sure that negatives may be able to persuade me otherwise, I believe that topical counterplans are an additional reason to vote for the affirmative. I think that all arguments are conditional by nature, but I will vote on "conditionality is bad" if the argument is clearly won.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: Although I do not like 2AR discos form out of the blue, I think that thinking debaters make strategic choices in rounds. If you can outweigh DA1, and if you can take out the link to DA2 by granting DA1, I think you would be smart to do so. I don't like 1AR's who label <u>everything</u> a turnaround, although turnarounds are certainly reasons to vote affirmative.

STYLE: I do not like debaters that I cannot understand. Speed is not the problem, clarity is. Please be clear, and good luck.

Michael Bryant, Dir. of Debate, West Georgia College
8 years coaching, 14 tournaments this year

Decision-Making Paradigm: If you can explain it, I'll listen. When left to my own devious devices, I will apply my own mutant brand of hypothesis-testing, with a heavy dose of resolutional focus. I assume all negative arguments to be independent and conditional, unless convinced to the contrary. Mixed with this resolution-based perspective is some critic of argument tenets based on gamesmanship ethics. Hence, presumption in my paradigm rests against such tricks as counterplans in 2NC or five minute blow ups of "conditionality bad" in 2AR. When push comes to shove, your choice of paradigm isn't nearly as important as the quantity and quality of your evidence and arguments.

Topicality: Given my preference for substantive arguments I am rarely persuaded by most of the semantical games that are being pushed off as topicality arguments. If you do have to go for "T," I prefer you get right down to the violations. Most argument on standards is relatively meaningless. Frankly, I have no idea how to resolve breadth vs. depth clashes. If the negative has a better definition that excludes the definition advanced by the affirmative, I will go negative just like I'd evaluate any other argument. One overwhelming bias of mine is in favor of severing portions of a plan proven to be non-topical. Negatives should know that I believe topicality arguments legitimate aff. discos based on the severing of non-topical planks.

Counterplans: I may be out in left field, but I've probably been one of the few people that believe the recent rash of counterplanning is a beneficial trend. Counterplans fit my paradigmatic biases since they often allow the debate to focus on clash at the resolutional level. Topical counterplans are OK, if you can explain the theory. Though I'll listen to anything you can construe to be a competition standard, I prefer net benefits or mutual exclusivity. My least favorite is philosophical. Though I admit I am biased in favor of counterplan debates, I attempt to counter this prejudice with liberal perspectives on permutations. I consider permutations to be simply tests of forced choice, which are not required to be topical. If the permutation is simply asserted, I'll certainly entertain asserted indictments of the policy mix envisioned by the permutation. Net benefits arguments are simply any disadvantages unique to the aff. proposal or the plan/counterplan mix which do not apply to the counterplan alone.

Disadvantages: My favorite part of the debate! My preference is for big sig creatures provided a decent link can be scraped up. Negatives would be best off starting the disads in 1NC so that aff. can fairly respond. Bodies will outweigh rights nine times out of ten. Ethic or paradigm shift arguments are my favorites. Add-ons are legitimate as long as they come before 2AR. You can only turn links or impacts, though add-ons which outweigh the impact of the disad are certainly one strategy that I'll listen to. I love to listen to those impact battles.

Style: Quick is slick, but you don't have to go fast to win modern debates. Grouping, selective dumping, cognition of evidence already read into the round, can all serve to allow a debater to cope with a spread attack. I detest interpersonal tension in rounds, though I am also peeved at people who act as if they'd rather be in Philadelphia. Frankly, I'm also bummed at C-Xs that are nothing more than "missed argument" sessions. You should watch me during the debate, I usally react to arguments that I find particularly good or bad. I haven't been reading as much evidence after the rounds as I used to. I like speakers that can be fast, persuasive, read lots of evidence, and that seem to be having a good time. My god, it's only a debate, so have some fun!

Judging Philosophy
Tom Burkholder, University of Kansas

I have begun to suspect that judging philosophies are more entertaining than enlightening. They seem to do little to modify debaters' behavior; more often, the reverse seems to be expected. When I judge, I shall do just that. I shall not make policy. I shall not test hypotheses. I shall not be "tabula rasa." I shall, as an educator, evaluate arguments made by students involved in competitive, academic debate. Thus, I shall bring certain expectations and preferences with me into each debate. Some of them are listed below.

PARADIGM: Because topics are usually worded as propositions of policy, I expect to hear debaters argue over courses of action. Arguing over other things (like paradigms) is fine, but that diverts attention from the topic. If you want to debate theory, go ahead. But you must know that I think such debates are boring. When policies are argued, I prefer that each team defend only one per debate; time is too short for more. If conditional arguments are used, the "conditions" under which they do or do not deserve consideration should be presented and defended. Unlike many judges, I do not view presumption as a function of risk. Presumption means that the present system is, and will remain, the present system until there is a reason to change. Presumption may be overturned by the affirmative but it never shifts. This means that my "standard of significance" is low; there must only be more (or better) reason to change than there is reason not to change.

TOPICALITY: It is a voting issue; to argue otherwise is folly. It is not a "reverse voting issue," but when presented as an obvious "time suck," the presenters' ethos suffers. More time should be spent comparing definitions to each other and to the plan than haggling over standards. At least for this year, please try to avoid demeaning the "framers'" intellect, ancestry, etc.

COUNTERPLANS: They must not be topical. They must be competitive. Competitiveness arguments must give me a reason to vote for the counterplan alone rather than the plan alone or the two in concert. That is, the counterplan must be germane and it must be somehow superior to the plan. Philosophical inconsistency (another hobgoblin of small minds?) is a very weak reason to vote for a counterplan. Mutual exclusivity only forces choice; it does not provide criteria for choosing.

DISADVANTAGES: Given the standard of significance outlined above, I don't need Armageddon to vote negative. There must only be more (or better) reason not to change than there is to change. That means links and uniqueness are more important to me than impact. Usually, the greater the impact, the more tenuous the links and the more questionable the uniqueness of the disadvantage.

EVIDENCE: This is still an oral activity. Evidence is an essential element of arguments presented by debaters in speeches. Judges should rarely intervene into the process by examining evidence. Thus, I will seldom call for evidence at the end of a debate. Debaters are always responsible for evidence they read. Challenges are serious business. When made, they become the only voting issue in the debate. If proven, violations almost always result in a loss and zero points. Groundless challenges bring the same upon the challenger. I do not think trading evidence, briefs, etc., between schools is acceptable behavior, and I would like to hear it made a voting issue (with a complete argument developed) when it has occurred.

OTHER: Debaters should tell me how to evaluate contradictions. If they don't, I'll disregard both of the contradictory positions. Cross examination responses must become arguments in subsequent speeches to have impact on the decision. Affirmatives must assume prima facie burdens for add-ons. I will rarely vote affirmative on a turn-around alone if case significance is gone. Dropping one argument to win another is fine, but probably not in last rebuttal. "Group-and-dump" strategies only reduce clash; they are not my favorite. If rebuttal speakers don't tell me which issues are important and why, I decide for myself--and that takes control of the debate away from the debaters and gives it to me (frightening thought). If things go too fast for me to flow I consider that a problem with the debaters' judge analysis rather than my manual dexterity. Counter warrants are silly. Be quiet when your colleague or opponent is speaking, asking questions, or answering questions; I'll cut points for "tag-team." I don't like people who are unnecessarily rude.

N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: Nicholas F. Burnett INSTITUTION: University of Pittsburgh

POSITION: Asst. Director of Debate YEARS OF COACHING: 9

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 6

I enjoy debates with clash, a modicum of theoretical discussion and clearly developed strategic positions. I am unlikely to reject, a priori, any position presented in a coherent and reasonably justified manner.

1. Decision Making Paradigm: I see myself as a critic of argument open to any number of clearly presented, theoretically justified decision paradigms. I have no particular objection to conditional argumentation; in fact, I believe some degree of conditionality is necessary to evaluate whether an affirmative team has fulfilled their burdens. I try to intervene in debates only when a team presents new arguments or clearly shifts from original positions - intervention is justified only to preserve fairness. I prefer first negative disadvantages to meet at least minimum standards (clear link, brink, impact) and am quite receptive to arguments that negative disads must meet the same standards of causal sufficiency as affirmative case advantages.

2. Topicality: Teams ignore an opponent's standards at their own risk. I find such standards invaluable in determining topicality arguments. I dislike topicality as a time-waster, but find myself voting on this issue more than I would expect.

3. Counterplans: Ultimately I believe that counterplans should function as reasons to reject the affirmative plan, not just the resolution. I prefer fewer competitiveness standards, clearly explained rather than a laundry list of tag lines. The strategic appeal of topical counterplans has piqued my interest, but I find the theoretical implications troubling - I don't want to see debates that turn on funding mechanisms or enforcement planks. I see counter warrants as the act of a desperately under-researched negative team. Sorry, Jack!

4. Add-ons/Turnarounds/Disco: Why do we still ask about these first two? Of course, they have become legitimate argumentative strategies. I dislike unannounced violent shifts in positions during a debate - I think fairness demands some notice. Radical position shifts increase the likelihood of this judge's intervention.

5. Style and other issues: I think debates ought to be fun and that debaters should be pleasant to one another - I also thought McGovern should have won in '72. Sigh! I have occasionally found myself in debates where the speed was excessive and I simply won't consider any issue presented too quickly, even if "explained" later. I dislike cross-x turning into a free-for-all; please avoid shouting questions and answers from partners. I'm really not crazy about New Age or Consciousness DAS. I think the authors are ill-equipped to deal with the rigors of thought necessary for policy analysis - in short, most are lunatics or dreamers. Finally, debaters who make some effort to crystallize positions and weigh advantages in the last two rebuttals will ultimately do better than a gasping, line-by-line rebuttal where all arguments appear to have the same strategic value.

KELLY L. BURNS
Assistant Debate Coach
6 tournaments

Wayne State University
One year coaching

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM -- I consider myself generally to be a policy maker. I see the round as revolving around the adv. and the disad. Attacks on solvency, inherency and harm all serve to reduce the adv. While attacks on links uniqueness and impact serve to reduce the disad. Absent topicality, it is very difficult for the negative to win my ballot by simply taking out the adv. Absolute inherency, solvency or harm arguments are rare. Inherency is perhaps the closest of the issues to being absolute if the neg wins, but too few argue it, and still fewer argue it correctly. I have voted neg of a couple of occasions this year when they did not have a disad or topicality. I like disads, especially developed ones. Because of the nature of many of the aff cases, they are miniscule, presumption could conceivably be an important issue. At the very least I expect that an argument will contain a statement of claim, proof and reasoning. Proof may be either analysis or evidence. My intervention in the debate round is directly proportional to the clarity of the round. If you tell me how to impact your arguments on the round then I will listen. If you don't then I am forced to put the round together myself and someone will not like how I do it. I am fair and when a situation arises where I must intervene I try to use the agreed on criteria for decision.

TOPICALITY --This is always an voting issue for me. Making arguments that it is not are almost fruitless. I see no words as incredibily important in the resolution. I mostly expect the aff to be reasonable, and if they can demonstrate that they are than regardless of neg definitions they are topical. I will not let negs define the aff out of the room.

COUNTERPLANS --I think that counterplans have become somewhat nonsensical this year. There are none that I have heard that I really like. I prefer mutually exclusivity and net benefits, but if everyone in the round agrees to something else, then I am game. I care about conditional counterplans as much as you do. I you say nothing, I do nothing. Topical counterplans become the property of the aff, unless it is conditional and the neg drops it, but if they don't then the impact becomes more advantage for the aff. One note, you may change the government if you wish, but given the type of aff case this year proving competitiveness is quite difficult.

ADD-ONS/TURNS/DISCO -- I like good strategy. That does not mean that the neg or aff has the option of reversing their position in one of the last two rebuttals. Add-ons and turns add to the aff advantage proportional to their development. Often a turn has the effect of mitigating the disad rather than capturing the impact for the aff. This is especially true with this new tendency to link flip.

STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES -- I don't care what your style as long as I can understand and flow you. If I can't flow you then you will see me just sitting there looking at you and that probably means that the argument you just booked through I won't vote on. If you abuse evidence you lose the round and you get zero speaker points. Also, if you make baseless evidence challenges, such as ones without the original or false ones, then you lose the round. Accusing someone of being a cheat falsely is as bad as being one. Don't lie to me or whine; both of which are punished appropriately. Have fun!!! I like to laugh, and humor always makes for an enjoyable debate. Finally, I have noticed this year that many teams are missing much in the interrelationship of arguments. I don't make the arguments for you so you should notice, in many rounds this would have changed my decision.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF JOB: Concordia College [John Burtis]

I have been trying to figure out how I would coach my students to debate if I were their judge. Rather than call myself a "condidit considerer" or some such, I think I would admit uncertainty regarding a preferred paradigm and encourage debaters to try what they feel best capable of explaining and defending in a given round. I generally find myself deciding who wins each of the issues and then trying to explain my decision in a consistent sort of manner. My role as an adjudicator/critic/educator is protean. In my many forms I constantly surprise and appall myself. There is so much argumentation theory that makes sense to me that debaters are advised to make their best case for what they want to do and to do it.

Inherency can be absolute, even in structural form, if it has demonstrated efficacy at the level the affirmative promises, if it has potential for efficacy equal to the affirmative program but is failing for reasons which may also limit the efficacy of what the affirmative proposes, or, if it is a new effort which has not yet had time to be a demonstrable success or failure. Significance is weighed against presumption [after a reduction for solvency problems and a subtraction of the effects of any disadvantages] with the latter increasing in importance with institutional support for the status quo. Institutional support may be measured by a policy's current attitudinal and structural entrenchment or/and by the length of time the policy has been part of the status quo. Topicality is probably an absolute voting issue. Topicality arguments are usually tedious and typically boring. Debaters should draw explicit links between standards, definitions, and violations. I will seriously consider the reverse voter argument but I have not voted for it yet because it has generally been supported by a warrant of punishment which is vengeance which is mine sayeth the Lord.

I am intrigued by this permutations business. I have not heard it argued very well yet but I suspect that it may provide a very solid base for arguments about intrinsicness of disadvantages and competitiveness of counterplans. In a given round I may vote either for or against an example of the resolution. Indeed, I may well vote for or against the whole damn thing if given the option. I have voted affirmative for topical counterplans and I look forward to the opportunity to vote negative for one as well.

Add-ons carry the same burdens as first line positions and should be pressed accordingly by the negative. It is easier to turn a disadvantage but the pseudo-turns I often hear deserve a good deal more pressure than they receive. Disco is the highest form of debate art but 2AR participants therein are subject to a 3NR by me.

All arguments are debatable in a round though some, like those in favor of time constraints, are given so much presumption as to make them almost impossible to lose. So, if you expect me to stick by my statements above without justifying your position(s) in a round you will lose. **The key to my philosophy is that I will only vote for issues. An argument is generally not an issue** unless the sponsor is willing to spend the time and emphasis required to make it such. As a result, positions must be clarified and solidified in rebuttals. Don't **just** extend an argument. Make an issue out of it. Explain it. Tell me why you win because of it. Be happy that you are so bright and the other fellows are so dull.

I will not ask for evidence at the end of a round unless I want to see it because it intrigues me. That happens twice each year. So, it is a good idea to repeat key phrases of key cards at key points in the rebuttals. I think teams should press case significance and solvency positions harder. I dislike tag-team debate. Prep time runs from the end of one speech to the ACTUAL start of the next.

I hate to feel bewildered/lost/confused/etc. at the end of any speech especially at the end of the rebuttal speeches. Think of yourself as a story teller and of me as a young, rather large child. I shall enjoy what you tell me if it is entertaining and has a good, well developed plot and I shall believe what you tell me if I can understand it.

1986 Statement

Name: Judy Butler Institution: Emory University
Position: Ass't Debate Coach Years coaching: 2
Number of Tournaments Judged at this year: 9

1) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM--I try to have no preconceived decision calculus. Unfortunately that leaves little to kick in if the debaters do not direct the decision making through argumentation. I like to look to what the debaters extend as far as comparison between their positions and left to my own devices I assume debate is an academic competition between two debate teams rather than a real world decision making situation.
2) TOPICALITY--I assume that topicality is just another argument with no particular value greater than any other argument. I do think that when debates get out of hand on this issue is when the debaters do not compare standards to violations or do not compare interpretations of words or burdens. I do not assume that being topical is a prereqisite to winning for the affirmative unless urged as such.
3) COUNTERPLANS To me a counterplan has the basic responsibility to provide reason to reject the affirmative (be that the resolution or the plan) as is the burden of any negative argument. How that is accomplished seems to me the debate over which standards of competitiveness are legitimate, and I am open to arguments on these issues. If the negative provides a reason to deny the affirmative through the presentation of alternative action, that is fine with me.
4) STYLE I personally prefer debaters who make an attempt to realize they are communicating with the judge and the other team. I don't have any objection to speed but an understanding of the need to be flowable is important. I do assume that for any claim to be an argument it has to have a reason, not a label. As a matter of fact, a label alone is a waste of time; it is the same as not saying anything at all. This obviously does not applu to references to earlier arguments but there must be a reason given for an argument when presented initially. I appreciate comparative argumentation in rebuttals and some type of resolution to arguments assumed to be voting issues. Since my personal value calculus is to uninteresting and lengthy to discuss here, it might be best for the debaters if they prevent it from becoming the basis for my decisions by default.

Number of years coaching: 3
Number of tournaments: 10

Dâne Butswinkas
George Mason University

I ascribe to no particular paradigm. I will accept any paradigm the debaters wish to argue for. However, I rarely find paradigm arguments to be of much importance in making a decision. At the end of the round I generally weigh advantages and disadvantages including turns and any other argument baring on the desireability of the plan/resolution.

I have found a number of topicality arguments to be very persuasive this year. I treat topicality like any other argument in the debate. Absent arguments to the contrary, I vote for the most desireable construction of the topic. A well applied standard can be useful, in most debates they are not. I prefer anaylsis concerning the implications of each construction of the topic, here is where standards get my attention.

Counterplans may be conditional as well as the affirmative mandates. I dislike conditionality bad debates. There are much higher goals for debate than punishment and deterence, hence I am unlikely to vote in favor of such unless the violation is particularly disgusting. That is true whether the issue is topicality, conditionality or whatever. Most counterplans fail on my ballot for lack of competition. I believe that net benefits is the only true standard of competition. I have voted for others. As of yet, I have heard no persuasive argument for the general illegitimacy of permutations. I have voted against permutations which substantially alter the affirmative plan as presented. If neither team, prior to the 2AR makes an argument otherwise, I usually disregard a topical counterplan whether conditional or not. Unless a counterplan is properly dropped out of the debate, I believe the affirmative is allowed to assume adoption of the counterplan and all the implications which follow.

Disadvantages which demonstrate a high risk but low probability tend on my ballot to outweigh low significance cases. I tend to vote for the least risky position - this places a higher premium on the avoidance of harm than on the achieving of all together new benefits. Consciousness, political or otherwise, is as persuasive to me as any other type of benefit or harm. This presumes, however, that the evidence is understandable and explainable. Often evidence on this type of issue is ambiguous and overclaimed.

So far, I am unaware of any particular stylistic aversion I may have. Like anyone else, I do not usually enjoy being yelled at. Speaker points on my ballot typically reflect analytical skills rather than presentational skills.

I intend to follow the rules of the NDT.

B. WAYNE CALLAWAY
DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

UNIV. OF WYOMING
23 YEARS AT WYO.

I have only judged at three tournaments this year.

I have always believed that debate is a specialized form of communication. I mean that a debater cannot be expected to meet the conditions of normal forms of communication. They have a very specialized audience who have been trained for debate competition. Therefore criticism; of "speed" and "spreding," are not fair means of evaluation. However, I do require that a team communicate arguments with the judge. I will not vote on any arguments that I do not understand or that I feel was not developed during the debate. Issues are more important that individual arguments and I will make no effort to keep score on how many arguments are covered or dropped during the debate. Whenever the student becomes so involved with coverage of arguments that proper "tag" lines do not exist and links are not presented, I will not consider the argument as important.

Both affirmative and negative teams must be consistent in their arguments, and should maintain an overall philosophy of their basic position. I find myself more in agreement with the concept of "policy maker" when I judge debates. But I am open to listen to the debate as it is presented and will base the decision on what occurs. I will consider different "theory" arguments but tend to be traditional in considering debate approaches. "Significance" is critical to me, I don't want to count "dead Bodies" on the flow sheet.

In general, I feel that most affirmative cases could be topical if they are reasonable and can be defended. Topicality should not be presented unless the student is very serious and wants to develop the argument completely. If presented in a serious way, I will decide the debate on topicality.

Evidence is a necessary part of good argumentation and should be directly linked to the specific argument. Do not force me to make connections and to develop the argument for you, I probably make the wrong conclusion. I am not impressed with a "dump" of evidence and then left to make my own conclusions. I seldom read evidence after the round unless unusual circumstances exist. It is the responsibility of the student to demonstrate impact and to determine the relative importance of arguments.

Counterplans should be used only when there is a sincere reason for the argument, and the student should justify their use.

Finally, let me say that the final decision in any debate will be based on my interpretation of which arguments became the most important issues. Therefore, rebuttals should focus on issues rather than complete coverage of all issue presented during the debate. Remember, I will not consider any argument that I do not understand.

Dr. Ralph E. Carbone
Director of Forensics
Butler University

14 years of debate coaching, 7 tournaments this year

PARADIGM: I view debate as an advocacy game, and my self as a critic of argument. The purpose of this game is to develop better, more rational decision-makers. The rules of the game are pretty much set in my mind. The order of the speeches and their length is predetermined. The general topic area is decided upon well in advance of the tournament. And try as they might, debaters CAN NOT change the rules after the round has begun!

ISSUES: TOPICALITY is the only "absolute voting issue" in debate, because it is an a priori concern. "Reasonability", "grammer", "social or field context", and "debatability" are the standards I adhere to. And it is the negative's job to demonstrate why the affirmative is non-topical. EXTRA-TOPICALITY only means that I throw out those parts of the plan, I don't reject the entire plan. SEVERABILITY seems real-world to me. JUSTIFICATION on the other hand is not a voter. Why a particular term appears in the resolution is beyond the affirmative's control. At best, justification is simply a means for introducing a counter-plan. INHERENCY is pretty much meaningless to me. Why a problem exists is less important that whether or not the affirmative can effect it. About the only time I vote on inherency is when the negative reads evidence that the plan has already been adopted or the affirmative drops the argument in rebuttals. SIGINIFICANCE, however, is still an important issue for me. Despite the current trend in debate, I have to see some good reason to vote for the affirmative - presumption still tells me that a "tie" goes to the negative. And I expect the affirmative to justify change based upon their constructive position. TURN-A-ROUNDS are a fine way to take out dis-ads, but they CAN NOT in by book take the place of case sig. SOLVENCY means that I expect to see some quantified level of probable advantage at the end of the round. Doubt about the level of solvency means I vote negative! DISADS, of course, should be linked to the specific case (in policy debate we focus on plans not resolutions - sorry Professor Rhodes no counter-warrants). Each da should have a reasonably high level or degree of probability and a reasonably likely impact (not everything has to end in a nuclear war nor is it likely to). God-terms like "Species" and "Rights Malthus" don't do much for me either. COUNTER-PLANS must be non-topical and competitive (mutually exclusive makes more sense to me than net beneficial but I will accept either). Systemic counter-plans are out! They are usually an abuse of fiat and destroy the division of ground created by the resolution. And if the counter-plan is "punted out of the round" by the negative the advantages (aka da's to the case associated with the counter-plan) go too!! (REMEMBER: they're a system) CONDITIONALITY is "ok" but not when it becomes abusive (3 counter-plans, 6 disads, and 20 or 30 case presses that collapse to T in 2NR could really make me take "punishment paradigm" seriously).

STYLE: Frankly, I'm sich and tired of "time-suck" negative debating: running T for no real reason or trying to junk up the round with mindless presses (like who, what, when, where, why, how many, want's the impact, etc.). I am not about to listen to it any more!!!!! And just because you can read 47 answers to a disad in 17 seconds doesn't mean that I can write them all down - and if I don't get them down.....they ain't in the round!!!!!!!!!!!!

DAVID CHESHIER
Georgetown University

3rd year coach
Judged at approximately 12 tournaments

These are my biases, though none are absolute:

1. I prefer good fast debate with strategies designed to form cohesive positions in the last two rebuttals. I like good arguments: I will not evaluate non-arguments (labels without reasons) whether or not that fact is noted by the other team, though whether an argument is good or not I leave to the interaction of the debate. I assign significantly higher burdens of proof to advocates wishing to persuade me to vote on theoretical "cheap shots" or low-link arguments of any kind. This is not to say that I've never voted on this kind of issue (occasionally it is unavoidable); but my advise to those wanting my ballot on these arguments is that you should devote substantial attention to it. I will freely confess that I seek to avoid allowing these issues to be round determinitive. Debate serves primarily advocacy ends, and this restricts my otherwise liberal view of what constitutes acceptable argument.

2. Topicality is a voting issue, extratopicality is not, bad theory arguments in themselves do not constitute voting issues, evidence distortion or fabrication is a voting issue regardless of the degree of violation. I've observed more and more debates this yr. where the charge of context violation has been casually made. I am fully prepared and willing to vote against a team making such an accusation if they can't substantiate it when pressed.

3. I see the role of the resolution as determining range of argumentative ground more than as a one-time jurisdictional check. Thus I have no predisposition against the topical counterplan (since debate remains on relevant ground) or against liberal use of repairs/intrinsicness arguments (which return debate to the resolution's core and away from arguably less germane issues). Repairs are acceptable when argued against the case, DAs, or CP advantages, and I believe repair abuse can be restricted if it is legitimately fiated, if the initiating team defends it, and if repairs are limited to the link. Abuse of topical CPs is restrained by strict competition.

4. My paradigmatic preference is policymaking though for me that allows a wide range of arguments, including intrinsicness. The affirmative's responsibility is to defend (by the end) a consistent set of policies (not necessarily all topical though topical action must be included) which prove the resolution acceptable by example. I do not believe that the affirmative must justify all examples of topical action, nor must they advocate a net topical package. The negative must prove these policies undesirable by comparison to competing alternatives. The minor repair and/or counterplan check affirmatives who might abuse this "net set of policies" perspective. Conflicting evidenced arguments or policies should not be advocated by either team.

5. I enjoy hearing well-run CPs, generic or not. I do believe in imposing strict competition standards, and enjoy hearing the issue debated in depth. "Permutations" are useful competition tests (if they contain topical action and are net beneficial the CP doesn't compete) though the affirmative should specify the exact nature of the permutation as early as possible. I have no strong disposition against conditionality, though for advocacy reasons I prefer unconditional defense (they should be kept to a minimum when run). The following competition arguments are usually artificial: resolutional, philosophical, "functional," and redundency. Net benefit is one of, if not the only, acceptable standard (I see mutual exclusivity as a net benefit question).

6. Good topicality debates are fine, but too often debate is focused on standards not made relevant to actual violations. I thus prefer that the time emphasis be on violations. I'm inclined to reasonability as a T standard -- I don't agree that it is meaningless or that it gives overwhelming advantage to the affirmative.

7. The use of punishment arguments seems to have declined, a trend I appreciate. Voting on "bad theory" (except perhaps conditionality) is usually an excessive penalty and watching punishment debates is unpleasant.

8. Evaluating significance: I often vote on evidenced turnarounds and assign lower probabilities to generic links. Unfortunately the case is rarely debated well enough to really cut into its significance.

9. Stylistic preferences: I prefer debaters who make choices, rudeness in a debate makes me uncomfortable (if excessive I cut points), I dislike hearing evidenced theory arguments, and I like to watch debaters who convey the image (if not reality) of believing their arguments and who strongly advocate them as a result -- I intensely dislike watching debaters who seem bored with their arguments.

I will respect procedural rules (disclosure) but not argument altering ones (i.e. best definition recommendations)

1987 N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: ALFRED L. CIPRIANI INSTITUTION: U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY

POSITION: ENGINEERING INSTR. YEARS OF COACHING: 3

1.) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I AM A STOCK ISSUES JUDGE AT THE START OF THE ROUND. DEPENDENT ON THE DEBATERS I CAN GO TO SEVERAL PARADIGMS BUT THE TEAMS MUST JUSTIFY MY DOING SO. I EXPECT SOME MINIMUM STANDARDS HOWEVER. I EXPECT THE ARGUMENTS TO BE RATIONAL AND COHERENT. I WILL NOT MAKE ARGUMENTS FOR EITHER TEAM AND WILL NOT CONSCIOUSLY INJECT MY OWN BIAS. I DO NOT PARTICULARLY ACCEPT THE DOOM AND GLOOM DISADVANTAGES. IN MOST CASES THE LINKS AND THRESHOLDS ARE ILL DEFINED AND PROBABLY ADVANCED BY DUBIOUS SOURCES OR EXAGGERATED BY THE DEBATERS THEMSELVES. IF YOUR HARM IS NUCLEAR WAR IN THE THIS YEARS TOPIC YOUR DA WILL BE DEFEATED IF THE OTHER TEAM JUST USES A RATIONAL LOGIC TRAIN.

2.) TOPICALITY: THIS YEARS TOPIC LEAVES A LOT OPEN TO INTERPRETATION BY ANY NUMBER OF SOURCES AS TO WHETHER AN AREA IS OR IS NOT A FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT. AFTER ALL THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT THE COURTS ARE PAID TO DECIDE. MOST NON TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS ARE WEAK THIS YEAR IN MY OPINION. I HAVE ONLY HEARD ONE OR TWO IN 30+ ROUNDS THAT HAD MUCH MERIT OR WERE ARGUED EFFECTIVELY. I DO NOT PENALIZE FOR EXTRATOPICALITY UNLESS IT IS A BLATANT ATTEMPT TO AVOID NEGATIVE DISADS. I DETERMINE BETTER DEFINITION BY THE REASONABLE MAN TEST.

3.) COUNTERPLANS: I DO NOT PARTICULARLY LIKE COUNTERPLANS. THEY MUST BE NON TOPICAL AND MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE WITH THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN. I HAVE NOT HEARD ANY COUNTERPLANS ON THIS YEARS TOPIC AND I HOPE I DO NOT.

4.) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: I HAVE NO COMPLAINTS ABOUT ADD-ONS AND ENJOY THIS STRATEGY. TURNAROUNDS TEND TO LACK SUBSTANCE AND OFTEN MAKE THE TEAM CLAIMING THE TURNAROUND LOOK LIKE IDIOTS WHO WERE NOT LISTENING TO THE OPPOSITION. I HAVE FOUND MOST TURNAROUNDS TO BE POORLY DEVELOPED LACKING IN CONVINCING ARGUMENTATION. DISCO IS FINE FOR DANCING BUT GETS OLD QUICKLY IN DEBATE.

5.) STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES: I ENJOY GOOD ORATORY STYLE. I REALIZE THAT MY CHANCES OF GETTING IT ARE POOR AT BEST. AT THE VERY LEAST, DON'T GET UNINTELLIGIBLE IN YOUR DELIVERY. I ENJOY DEFINITIVE SIGN POSTING THAT ALLOWS ME ENOUGH TIME TO WRITE IT DOWN WITHOUT MISSING THE NEXT POINT. IT'S NICE FOR YOU TO LOOK UP EVERY ONCE IN A WHILE AND SEE HOW I AM RECEIVING YOUR SPEECH. I LIKE DIRECT FRONTAL CONFRONTATIONS ON THE ISSUES OF THE DEBATE. KEEP IT ORGANIZED, SIGN POSTED, COHERENT, AND LOGICAL.

NAME: Glen W. Clatterbuck INSTITUTION: Miami U.
POSITION: Assistant Coach YEARS IN COACHING: 14
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR: 5

1) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM. I have seen very few rounds where the theoretical paradigm of debate had a practical impact on the outcome of the round. Most rounds are decided by matters that would be voting issues under any paradigm: violations of the minimal rules of the "game"; tactical, evidentiary, or logical failures which make one side's arguments appear glaringly inferior to the critical listener; or occasionally ethical violations. When I am not forced to decide in a judge's parallel roles of game-referee, teacher-critic, or ethics-enforcer, I am a classical hypothesis tester [something akin in practice to a traditional stock-issues judge but with much wider negative options]. For the affirmative to justify adoption of the resolution, they must establish and defend an advantage unique to the resolution, from a prima facie beginning through to last rebuttal. The negative may argue any combination of arguments to prevent the affirmative from conclusively demonstrating that adoption of the resolution is warranted, with presumption clearly against the resolution in all cases of ties. I have seen few debate rounds where teams argued theoretical/paradigm issues in such a way as to make them voting issues, but I willingly listen to such arguments. If issues are not resolved for me in the round, I "intervene" as argument critic only by going back to the last valid position; I read no evidence, clarify no responses after rounds, and intervene only to protect minimal rules of fairness and competitive balance (evidence distortion, overtime, 2AR shifts, etc.).
2) TOPICALITY. I am voting less this season on topicality because negs are trying so hard to gain an edge through obscure approaches to "best" definitions that they make unreasonable affs look sound by comparison. Most teams spend too much time on standards that are used not at all or poorly, and too little time on violations themselves. Better definitions in the round are contextual, correctly applied in grammar and syntax, and part of a unitary rather than fragmented interpretation of the resolution. Given the preemptive nature of topicality, time-killing topicality arguments strike me as almost as reprehensible as unsupported accusations of falsification. Similarly I find "no voting issue" responses generally contradict the overt effort of most affs to meet the topic; I've never been confronted with a team who argued only "no voting issue" and who could justify that position. Extratopical plan provisions are illegitimate because the affirmative has abandoned pure advocacy of the resolution, so positions resting on those provisions (advantages, spikes, even up to the whole case) are void; I see attempts at abandoning, amending, or editing extratopical provisions as concession of the issue [see disco below].
COUNTERPLANS. Counterplans must offer a clear alternative to voting aff (nontopical but same advantage, comparative net benefit, mutual exclusivity, etc.) and to win one of these conclusively usually means to meet analogous burdens of documentation to an aff case; 30-second socialism generally has as much chance of winning as would a 30-second 1AC just on pure evidence comparison. Of course these standards for true policy-option counterplans [conditional or committed] are stricter than for metaphorical counterplans such as conditional counterplans to reinforce inherency or hypothetical counterplans to illuminate justification arguments. Counterwarrants can be workable. I find metaphorical uses of permutation to illustrate another issue more appealing than literal attempts at amendment.
4)ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO. Aff must win the case to win, or the topic ceases to be the focus of debate, but most "turns" aren't really well-documented additive advantages by any reasonable standard anyway. I don't mind conditional or nominally contradictory positions but you can't disco away contradictions in evidence, etc. I'd rather see conditionals explicitly kept or dropped (I ignore "keep the one you think is stronger" requests from 2NRs) but things that only are contradictory by assumption (e.g., PMA and DA) don't even need that. Discoing that would be revisionist issue definition (retracting positions, amending plans, etc.) never flies; anything once in the round is there for keeps.
5)STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES. I would like to see less needlessly gauche behavior: blinding speed in a 7 minute 1AC; mindless roadmaps; all responses after number 4 labeled "number next"; extensive shouting from colleagues while on the floor; speed beyond the ability to articulate; volume beyond a 747; labels and citation given but no evidence actually read. I only consider intervention to protect the basic integrity of the activity, such as on evidence challenges; I take full citations on demand equally seriously. See 1 above on never reading evidence; keep that in mind when selecting the speed to read key cards!

Shelley Clubb
Assistant Debate Coach

University of Louisville
Second Year Coaching
11 Tournaments/ 70 + rounds

Decision-making Paradigm: I would basically consider myself a policy-maker if there are no arguments to the contrary. I attempt to evaluate issues based on standards presented in the round and try not to intervene. I don't find any particular debate strategy offensive, with the exception of conditionality taken to an extreme (i.e., blipping out multiple underdeveloped counterplans; if this isn't sufficiently explained, ask me). Since debate is an educational/creative activity, punishment arguments are usually unpersuasive. An argument must make a claim as well as contain some explanation (evidence, analysis, etc.) to support that claim; otherwise, it is not an argument.

Topicality: I will vote on topicality, although I dislike 'T' debates because they are usually a mess of unexplained taglines. If topicality is going to determine the round, standards should be clear and applied to the violations. Violations should be developed and clearly applicable to the case.

Counterplans: Mutual exclusive and net benefits are preferred. Absent standards for permutations, I view them only as a test of competition. Absent disposition standards, topical counterplans become part of the resolution. Conditional counterplans must be removed from the round by the debaters; I will not drop it from the round for you simply because it is conditional.

Style and other issues: Speed is not a problem as long as you are clear and tell me where you are. Cards should match labels. I will read important evidence after the round. Discos in 2AR require some prior warning if they are to persuade me.

DAVID L. BOMAN
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
6 YEARS COACHING (COLLEGE)
13 TOURNAMENTS (NDT)

Writing a judging philosophy is getting more and more difficult to do. The whole idea assumes biases for or against particular arguments or positions. I find myself holding to fewer and fewer predispositions toward debate theory. I guess this means, in the parlance of the activity, that I am becoming a "gamesman." To me this means that I vote according to the arguments presented in the round and do not, if at all possible, impose myself into the debate. Keep this in mind as you read the following.

TOPICALITY: this is an issue that is very open to development by the debaters in a round. Is it a voter? An absolute voter? Does affirmative have presumption? Can it be a reverse-voter? Should definitions be reasonable? Limiting? The best? The broadest? Are standards needed? Can they be developed in the violations? These questions, and many more, can and should be decided in the round. In short, this issue has become like any other issue in the debate. (Sorry Mike).

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: I suppose I have addressed this above. I think the whole idea of paradigms in competitive debate has received too much attention. If a team wants to put me into a particular paradigm I am willing. If the other team wants to put me into a counter paradigm, I will listen to the arguments and go with the winner. Do me a favor; tell me what to do when you get me into a particular paradigm. Too often, debaters will spend a lot of time arguing paradigms without making any application to the arguments in the round. So what if I am an educational hypothesis tester in a particular round - how do I use this to decide issues in a way different from how I would normally decide issues.

INHERENCY: who cares? No one ever talks about it. I support an affirmative should be inherent. How they go about being inherent is up to them and whether or not they are successful in accomplishing this is up to the negative.

STANDARD OF SIGNIFICANCE: this is determined in the round. I will make one caveat: affirmative should quantity/qualify their significance in some way. If I have any bedrock bias left it is that the status quo has presumption. Change should only be allowed if there is substantial reason to change. "Free Speech is Nice" might be enough for an affirmative ballot. However, affirmatives will have to work very hard to get it if this is all they can offer.

CROSS-EXAMINATION: this time should be used to find things out. Do not ask about the weather to kill time so your partner can have the prep time. Also, I do not like tag-team C-X. There are some times in life when an individual should have to stand alone and face what comes. C-X is one of these times.

EVIDENCE STANDARDS: absent any ethical questions, evidence standards are decided in the round

COUNTERPLANS: these are OK. They should be non-topical, competitive, and have something going for them when they ae compared to the affirmative. How they accomplish these goals, is up to the debaters.

COUNTERWARRANTS: these are OK too. Given that you can link almost any argument to this year's topic, I don't know why a team would go this route. But, if it feels good, go ahead.

ADD-ONS, TURNAROUNDS, DISCO: these are all OK (although I prefer-ROCK-AND-ROLL/DISCO is dead). I do think that turnarounds to DAs should be true flips and not just additive advantages. Negative must point this out and explain.

STYLE AND OTHER CONCERNS: if I can't understand it I can't flow it and I can't vote on it. Other than that I like rounds to be pleasant. It is possible to be aggressive without being rude. It is possible to be competitive without being an S.O.B. Above all, there is no reason to personally attack your opponent either directly or indirectly. Teams that cross these lines lose points and, in extreme situations, lose rounds. Where is the line? What is extreme? When in doubt, be nice.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
CHUCK BRODY

YEARS COACHING: 4
ROUNDS: 70

DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA: I consider myself a stock issues judge in rounds where no criteria is presented. I am willing to listen to any paradigm advanced in the round, as long as the criteria are developed. A disadvantage is not required for me to vote negative. I like first negative arguments, I still wonder why presumably good people tolerate evil.

TOPICALITY: Mr. Killmer has not convinced me that topicality is not a good voting issue. The negative can win this issue if they are willing to spend time developing a strong argument. I do not vote on this issue at the drop of a hat, if all your willing to spend is thir seconds it probably can be spent better in other places.

COUNTERPLANS: I will vote for a counterplan if it is nontopical, competitive, and has a net benefit over the affirmative. This topic seems to lend itself to a lot of good negative counterplan positions.

QUALITATIVE ADVANTAGES: This like every other topic has a place for qualitative advantages. If the affirmative is able to justify the qualitative advantage, I will vote for it.

DELIVERY OF ARGUMENTS: I do not mind fast rapid-fire debates. I do mind debaters who can not speak clearly at a high rate of speed. I will not call for evidence which I can not understand. If I miss an argument I will call for the evidence if it is a voting issue in the round. This does not mean I will make the argument for you however.

IN GENERAL: 1) debaters are urged to isolate voting issues in the round; 2) No divine responses in 2AR; 3)Full source cites are essential; if its your card, it is your responsibility to have the complete site.

Steven C. Combs
Director of Forensics

Occidental College
Three years collegiate coaching

Five tournaments judged

Since pertinent legislative action does not directly follow the express intentions of a given aff. or neg. team, I can find justification for policy making only as it enhances the resolution of a hypothetical discussion. Thus, the best characteristics of the policy making paradigm are those which facilitate rational debate. The central features which I favor are: strict adherence to a single focal point for attack, since this improves clash; consistency in argumentation, for this rewards those with a well planned position; and, emphasis on the realities of governmental intervention, because these are factors rational beings must deal with constantly.

I also borrow from the tenets of hypothesis testing. By focusing attention on the resolution versus the non-resolution, hypo testing reminds us of what should be central to any debate round--the resolution itself. This model has the advantage of imposing strong presumptive burdens on the aff. Also, hypo testing does not artificially distinguish between the status quo, minor repairs, and counterplans since the nature of inherency lies in the desirability of non-resolutional alternatives, and not the ability to act per se.

The purpose of debate is to clash and this requires depth of discussion. Since debate rounds have inviolate time limits, the discussions must also be limited. Although I am not inextricably tied to the notion of each team's debating a single policy, I find it difficult to allow a team two policies but not three, or three but not four. By adhering to a single thesis a team avoids the attack that any number of policies greater than one is justification for any absurd number of positions. If allowed, a neg. can argue so many positions that they can beat an aff. and still fail to explore any issue fully. By supporting a single thesis a team can develop arguments and clash while still maintaining some flexibility.

Inherency is a procedural issue to define the status quo or non-resolution. It does not need to be linked with the neg. position; like topicality, inherency can be argued in observation form and is considered as a voting issue independently of other arguments.

Topicality is a necessary pre-condition to meaningful clash. I have never found a consistently adequate definition of "reasonableness" and, therefore, reject this standard as useless. Instead, I view topicality just like any other argument, voting for the team that supports the best argued position. Parameters are not binding, but can be useful in determining the direction of the topic. Extratopical plans are usually safe, but I have voted on the argument that extratopicality is a voting issue. I honestly have not heard enough topicality arguments to have a bias regarding this year's wording of the resolution.

Counterplans and minor repairs are nothing more than types of neg. positions. Any neg. position must be nontopical and competitive. To be competitive a team must present a reasonable substitute to the aff. plan. This is best shown by proving that the counterplan alone is superior to the counterplan and the resolution together. I do not like counterwarrants.

I do not like for last rebuttalists to grant arguments to jettison other issues. At the least I want the first rebuttalist to indicate the ability to make such arguments and under what circumstances they will be used in last rebuttal. I hate shifts in position, especially departures from cross-ex answers. Failure to answer a cross-ex question without justification can be an independent voting issue. I will only read evidence after the round if I was distracted or ran out of ink during the initial reading of the card. Turnarounds are fine, but they should be legitimate TAs, not just labels.

I enjoy humor, good cross-ex, and well mannered debaters. Most of all I want to hear good arguments--well supported and justified. If you memorize the rule and forget the reason you are in trouble. But with good reason anything is possible. Evidence distortion is an absolute voting issue. Speed should be proportional to clarity.

D. Douglas Cotton
Loyola Marymount University '83
Northwestern University Law School '86
I'm currently clerking for a federal district court judge

I. PARADIGMS

A blank chalkboard and the mind of a newborn are both tabulae rasa. I don't trust people who tell me they're backboards or infants, and I wouldn't want either to judge me. This is not the floor of Congress or a courtroom, although if you want to address me as "your honor," that's fine with me. This is a game. Everyone talks twice and we have set time limits. I do think, however, that we should receive letterman's jackets for debating. The jackets would come in handy to cushion our old trophies when we pack them in boxes and put them in the attic. If I were forced to choose a paradigm, I'd choose policy making.

I've been corrupted by the real world. I find it very difficult to believe that nuclear war will result from overturning one obscure, or even not so obscure, federal court case. I'm reluctant to admit it, but three weeks ago in a ninth circuit opinion, I personally helped touch off a nuclear war by curtailing someone's first amendment rights. Wait a minute. Maybe I prevented a nuclear war; I should be congratulated. After all, how many of us can actually say we've prevented a nuclear war. It is also hard to persuade me that I should accept an incredibly vague and twisted link card because the impact of a DA is cataclysmic.

I like the idea of blowing-up DAs started in 1NC (and after all, it is your paper that I'll be using). Unfortunately, the execution is often poor. You must take great pains to keep it clear. If the 1NC mumbles through a lousy link card, the 2NC better start over if he/she really wants to win the DA.

II. TOPICALITY

I'm sure that I've voted on topicality before, but I don't remember when. Now I'm supposed to vote for the better definition. I think topicality is a jurisdictional issue; therefore, you only need to have a reasonable interpretation of the topic. Now since it must be the better definition, I think it must be better than no definition.

I rapidly disregard extra-topical plan provisions.

III. COUNTERPLANS

I loved them when I was negative and I hated them when I was affirmative. Today I am undecided. For those of you who don't have research staffs (are they still called graduate assistants?) to do your work for you, they provide the means to compete and still graduate with a respectable GPA; they certainly saved mine. Counterplans must be nontopical. Topical counterplans generally disappear. I would prefer not to have to vote for the affirmative based solely on a topical counterplan, but if you disco well, I could be convinced. Counterplans must be competitive. I like mutual exclusivity and net benefits. Creative artificial competitive arguments won't do it.

A proponent of permutation theory tried explaining it to me the other day. I didn't understand it then. If you think you want to try it during the round, be my guest.

Conditional counterplans allow the affirmative leeway to disco if they argue it correctly.

IV. ADD-ONS, TAs AND DISCOs

Disco did not die with the Bee Gees and John Travolta. When one side makes contradictory arguments, you can and should strategically grant one or more of the arguments. Have some guts.

Most turn-a-rounds aren't. If they are, they're fine with me. I dislike 1ARs labeling all twelve responses to a DA as a TA.

Add-ons are OK, but they're not a replacement for 1AC advantages.

V. STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES

Style: Has this disappeared completely?

Cross-x: Answer your own questions. You may lose points for answering for your partner. If he is screwing up and going to lose the round for you, it's probably worth it. If not, keep quiet.

Speed: I don't read evidence after the round so if you think it's important, read it intelligibly. You all can talk faster than I can write. That's why they invented tag lines. Debators always speak clearly when reading tag lines ("free speech is more important than life itself"), DA impacts ("you cause Nuclear war"), or turn-a-rounds ("we prevent nuclear war"). If I write down the tag line and you mumble the evidence, I'll just cross out the tag line.

I can understand as fast as you can talk; but, if you are incomprehensible because you're trying to talk faster than you're able to, you're wasting your time and mine. If you're not too arrogant, you'll know when you're exceeding your limits. If you are exceeding your limits, slow down. If your too arrogant, tough luck.

If I were to ask for evidence after the round and every third or fourth word was unreadable, I'd throw it out. If I listen to a card and the same thing happens, I'll also throw it out.

You're right, all this gives an advantage to those who can speak clearly more rapidly than you. If they also are more intelligent, have better evidence and are more cunning, you'll lose.

Sources: You can find somebody somewhere who will say anything. Therefore, it's important that we know who said it, who he/she is, and sometimes even, would you believe it, where it was published. When you quote a court case I'll assume that you're reading from the majority opinion. If you're quoting the minority opinion, a concurrence or the briefs, you should say so.

General advice: I haven't judged many rounds this year, but I doubt I'll have any problems understanding any substantive arguments you'll make. Slow down just a little, look at the big picture, and make strategic moves. You'll be rewarded handsomely.

Skip Coulter Samford University Director of Debate
19 years of coaching 12 tournaments

1. Paradigm: I am a hypothesis tester. I seek to discover the truth of the resolution. All arguments are conditional.

2. Topicality: I vote on topicality far more than anyone thinks I do. I enjoy developed topicality arguments. I think the debate should focus on the violations. If an affirmative teams runs topicality preempts in the first affirmative speech, I will probably vote negative on topicality if it's extended. Topicality preempts are the closest thing to a concession speech that an affirmative team can deliver.

3. Counterplans: A couterplan must either be mutually exclusive or net beneficial. I consider permutations a test, not an initiative. I like counterplans, both to counter the affirmative approach or to make disadvantages unique.

4. Add-Ons/Turnarounds/Disco: I like turnarounds, because they often feature specific refutation, specific attention to negative arguments. Disco is fine in 1AR. I give the affirmative little leeway in 2AR, given the fact that most negative positions are clear in 1 n now.

5. Style: This is very important to me. I like charisma; I insist on clear delivery. I want to hear the mandates of the counterplans clearly. I want the thesis of the disadvantage explained. I want a 1AC that is a treat to hear, not the closest thing to 1AR that the first affirmative can imagine.

Debate is an extra-curricular activity. I think it should be fun. Loosen up and let your personality come out in the debate (well, most of you! Ha!). Make yourself an easy person to identify with and I'll reward you with both good points and extra attention to your arguments. This is my last tournament. I've enjoyed it, and you students are the primary reason! I feel lucky to have been associated with you. Thanks.

Skip

EARL CROASMUN -- FINDLAY COLLEGE

1. PARADIGM: none. In other words, if I vote for or against an argument, it is not because I have a semi-religious commitment to some paradigm. Besides, I know the people who write the papers on paradigms and I thus know how much credibility to give them.

2. TOPICALITY: is a voting issue. It can be argued in either negative constructive, just like any other constructive argument. Topicality 'standards' are rarely important, and they tend to degenerate into buzz-words and catch-phrases rather than supported arguments. For example, I have heard many squabbles over the educational value of depth versus breadth, but never a solid argument on either side.

3. COUNTERPLANS: fairly high standards of competitiveness. Any aspects of the counterplan that do not compete are fair game for the affirmative. You cannot 'conditionally' counterplan any more than you can conditionally read evidence into the round or conditionally get married.

4. TURNS/DISCO. Any arguments in the round are fair game. If the negative is so dumb, for example, that 2AR can grant something and use it to beat negative arguments, that is the fault of the negative and not the affirmative.

5. OTHER. Most judging philosophies say the same things. I will try to be more specific. For openers, speed is okay but enthymemes are not. I hate arguments that make no sense until 2NR, when he says "here's what we meant." I hate arguments where major steps or links are left in the brain of the debater and never given in the debate. I do not enjoy generic links, disadvantages with "brinks," or arguments over what form of government is best. I dislike weighing evidence that is based entirely on an appeal to authority, if the only source provided is a last name and a year. If you are going to claim, for example, that a small group of terrorists could take over the U.S. in sixty days, you had better give me a darn good reason to believe such a claim.

With age I have developed some minimum standards for what I will bother to flow. For instance, it should be more than a sentence fragment. I have judged at only a few tournaments this year, so make as few assumptions as possible concerning jargon and abbreviations. I know that "toto" is not just a dog, "Con-Con" is not French dance, and "FOIA" is not the Southern pronunciation of "foyer." Other labels and acronyms should be explained.

One final point: end-of-the-year tournaments (districts and nationals) are competitions between consenting adults. Thus I tend to give more leeway than I would during the regular season, when educational rationales are more important. TO BORROW A PHRASE FROM N.B.A. PLAYOFF REFEREES, I "LET THEM PLAY"

Bruce R. Daniel
University of Kansas

75 rounds
9 Years coaching

TOPICALITY: is a voting issue, jurisdictional in nature. It is the first argument to be evaluated in the round. Affirmative must only meet the better definition defended in the round, not the best. Some rationale must be given for which definition is the best. Negatives should give examples of topical affirmatives which meet their standards. The same standards apply when affirmative argues that a counterplan is topical. It becomes aff burden to show better definition in order to prove counterplan is topical.

COUNTERPLANS: I don't think agent counterplans are competitive (but I have voted for many this year, even surrender to the Soviets). No agent of change in the resolution indicates that the substantive issues of the values of FOS/FOP are the focus for discussion, as opposed to who removes restrictions. Only those provisions which directly compete with the aff plan should be evaluated in terms of advantage accrual. Competition can be established through mutual exclusivity with the plan or net benefits. Permutations are merely a standard to test competition, and not an actual replanning.

EVIDENCE: I read cards when I need to, although I've discovered that simply listening to them reveals enough information for me, except in rare instances where the quality of the evidence must be strictly compared in order to evaluate relative quality. I will look at evidence if it becomes a question of ethics. Ethical violations must be proven by having the original or a photocopy of original (or of relevant indices indicating source material does not exist). Do not challenge without this documentation. A proven charge results in a loss with 0 speaker points. Each team is responsible for the evidence they read in the round, no matter if it has been borrowed. False charges are subject to the same penalty. This is a very serious matter! Additionally, evidence should be comprehensible!

SIGNIFICANCE: I evaluate the relative significance of the positions advanced by both teams in order to see which side has the greatest benefit. If other issues (like T/Competition) are moot, then the side with the greatest advantage wins. Solvency arguments are a good way to shift the scale to your side; they are generally not a reason to vote against a team, but they can combine with disads to give the neg a victory. On this topic, I am especially willing to well-established rights positions as decision rules, but don't just flip the D-rule out without any explanation. Turn-arounds are additional affirmative significance.

PERSONAL CAVEATS: I dislike incomprehensible speeches, and will generally indicate, with some form of nonverbal communication, when you have reached this point. A complete argument indicates the outcome (good or bad) of the position. Until a complete argument is presented, there is no reason why the opposing team need respond, other than to say that "we reserve the right to respond when the implications of the argument are demonstrated." This prevents a good many impact flips, which serve to clutter a round unnecessarily. I am generally willing to listen to whatever the two teams decide I should listen to--so make a justifiable argument for the positions, theoretical or substantive, which you would care to run.

Cori Dauber Asst. coach, Northwestern University
5th year coaching, judged at 5 tournaments

1. Paradigm: I consider myself a "critic of argument". This means that I will largely resolve the debate in the manner you tell me to. Left on my own, I'm probably pretty close to policy maker. All of this assumes that what you are saying in a debate round actually constitutes an argument, as opposed to a tag line. Explanations and impact statements are called for. I intervene when I have to intervene in order to sign the ballot and get out, ASSUMING all relevant issues meet the standard for argument. I will intervene anytime to decide something was an unexplained tag and hence irrelevant.
2. Topicality. The best "T" debate is always more boring than the worst of any other kind of debate, but if you must . . . at least explain how arguments on violations and arguments on standards coexist in the same universe. If possible standards debates are even more boring than violations debates. If you met a definition just say so and get on with it. If a standard is not necessary to win aviolation get on with it. Generally the best definition inthe round is the one that emerges through the argument process as best meeting the criteria laid out (debatabiliy etc).
3. Counterplans. Junk standards are junk standards. Competition is a substantive issue (ie cards help). Permutations are ok, conditionaliy is ok (multiple counterplans are a definite bummer) and topicaliy is ok, though affirmative then has every right to at least try a capture. Agent counterplans are about as exciting/interesting as T debates, but as always I'll sit through anything.
4. Adds/Turns. Whatever. As for discos, fair warning requires interpable warning at FIRST AVAILABLE OPPORTUNITY. If the disads double turn nin 1N there is no good reason for waiting until 2AR to point this out. Strict standards on the 2AR since in earlier speeches opposition still has the ability to complain.
5. Style. Two things are relevant here. First I punish incomprehensibility. Either do the drills or don't talk that fast. If I couldn't hear or make sense out of it it DIDN"T HAPPEN and I certainly am not going to call for cards I couldn't hear. Second, evaluating the comparative benefits of evidence is NOT my job. I do not call for evidence unless if I don't I can't sign the ballot. Your job is to tell me why your cards are better, not to assert that they are and demand that I call for them after the round, because I won't do it.

Scott Deatherage
Northwestern University

3 Years Coaching
56 Rounds This Year

I am open to argument on any issue other than format. I do, however, have some strong biases. In the absence of compelling argument I will impose certain assumptions on the debate process. Additionally, when I am required to evaluate certain competing claims, my biases are likely to guide my choices. My purpose here is to articulate those biases.

Topicality arguments ought to be well developed and clearly articulated. The purpose of the resolution, in my view, is to limit discussion and to divide ground. A good topicality debate goes beyond the worn out tags about the merits and demerits of limitation. Rather, what is too frequently left out by debaters is a discussion of how competing interpretations of particular words or phrases serve to limit the topic and to divide ground or how they fail to do so. In that sense, a particular negative interpretation may be grammatically or legally correct, but may too severely limit affirmative ground. Similarly, an affirmative interpretation may legitimize a variety of actions which effectively destroy the meaning of the topic. I do not recall ever having voted for arguments as to why topicality is not a voting issue, nor do I anticipate doing so in the future.

Counter-plans often create defensible ground for the negative where there was none before. I hold counter-plans to a reasonably strict standard of competitiveness. A competitive counter-plan is one that would be better by itself rather than in some combination with the affirmative plan. I have voted for conditional counter-plans more often than not, but believe generally that they make for sloppy debate and teach irresponsible argument.

Essentially, I would describe myself as a policy-maker. At the end of the debate I compare the net benefits of competing options. I am amused, at times, by the gravity of particular relationships that teams are willing to accept. For example, I am unconvinced that a transformation to a socialist government would be stopped by the extension of First Amendment rights to a few hundred school children. There are only six socialists in the country and their idealistic dreams are unlikely to be interrupted by kids with longer hair. Too often, the issue of probability is not discussed in sufficient detail. Additionally, I am intrigued by the role that evidence is assigned in most debates. Why should I believe Gus Hall's claim that a socialist transformation is under way? What concrete signs of the change are there? Similarly, I think debaters too often place too much emphasis on documenting the obvious. Why, for example, should I require the negative to read six cards proving that an economic depression would be a bad thing. Certainly the issue is open to debate, but in the absence of a compelling reason why a depression would be good, I am willing to accept that it would be bad even without evidence. A simple complaint that no cards are read on the issue is unlikely to be persuasive to me. Unfortunately, useful evidence challenges/comparisons are too often left out as the time pressure mounts in a given rebuttal.

I should comment briefly about how individual issues in debates are resolved. As I see it, there is no way of evaluating many arguments in the absence of some subjective determinations. Often, issues are unresolvable in the absence of some "judge intervention." Making such subjective determinations is, in my estimation, part of a judge's responsibility as an educator and a critic. To ask a judge to ignore his or her own intelligence and experience in putting debates together is to reduce the judge to the role of a mindless information processor. Debate would become only a test of speed and comprehensibility. To be certain, a judge's first responsibility is to be fair. However, it is educationally bankrupt, if not impossible, to determine the outcome of most debates without some degree of subjective evaluation. Anyone who claims that they do not "intervene" is only fooling themselves.

1987 N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: Warren Decker INSTITUTION: George Mason University

POSITION: Director of Debate YEARS IN COACHING: 17

The decision making paradigm which I use most often is the stock issues paradigm. I will on occasion, if persuaded to do so by the debaters, adopt a different paradigm. I do not like hypothesis testing and I prefer that the debaters provide me with a cogent, consistent position. If positions conflict I will respond well to a request to dismiss a given position and upon occasion may well dismiss both positions. Since I prefer the stock issues paradigm I will vote on case issues. I can be persuaded by a good inherency argument or an argument which claims the affirmative has little or no significance. I will also consider well developed and appropriate claimed solvency arguments. I really don't respond well to many theoretical arguments since they are usually products of the overly active minds of debaters using the rules of the game to avoid debating substantive issues. I expect arguments to be clear, cogent and supported by evidence which is well documented so that all parties in the round can evaluate the credibility of that evidence. Furthermore, I will reward the team which presents their evidence in such a way that I can understand it when presented orally.

Topicality is a voting issue for me and the "better" definition is decided in the round. Extratopicality is also a voting issue if the team that forwards the argument can indicate what the removal of the extratopical portions of the plan will do to the workability of the affirmative plan. I realize that the wording of some propositions make it difficult for an affirmative to win, but I don't except that as an answer to a topicality argument.

Counterplan debates are fine as long as the negative presents them as well developed alternatives to the affirmative position. I don't particularly like multiple counterplans since any number over one is usually not well developed. I normally will not allow a team to drop a position once presented so keep this in mind you decide to disco. Turnarounds are find as long as they are well argued.

Style is important to me and I may value it more than a lot of my colleagues. I very much dislike incoherent babble followed closely by a plea to read evidence. If you want me to vote on an argument it better be presented in a fashion that I can understand and comprehend. Furthermore, I do not consider an argument complete if I cannot understand the evidence used to support it. Incomprehensibility is rewarded with lowered points and an occasional loss if it substantially harms the arguments.

Mark DeLoach
University of Southern California
Graduate Assistant

Second Year Coaching
9 Tournaments Judged
at this year

Decision Making Paradigm: I do not impose any format on any given debate round. Instead, if it is argued, I will accept almost any role that the debaters propose and defend. If not argued, I consider myself a policy-maker given the constraints of the debate process. I generally dislike reverse-voting issues and punishment positions. Conditional arguments and counter-warrants are all right if justified. I do prefer debaters who develop consistent positions and explain them well.

Topicality: I dislike topicality debates for the most part, unless the violation is well-developed and clear. These arguments should be explained, rather than a tag-and-run strategy. Also, there should be some standards applied to the violation to give me some clear way to resolve conflicting interpretations.

Counterplans: I believe that the counterplan as a whole should give some reason for rejection of the affirmative. I believe that they should be non-topical, and either mutually exclusive or net-beneficial. I am also persuaded by permutations and extra-competition arguments to reduce the net-benefit of the counterplan. Conditional counterplans are all right, but I will vote on conditionality bad arguments if the team can argue the theory well.

Other: I like debaters who put together a coherent position for the round, especially in the last two rebuttals. Debaters who do this will be less likely to face the prospect of me piecing a round together for them. I will call for evidence after a round if someone gives me a reason to do so. I don't like tag-team CX. I am impressed by case-specific positions.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Department of
Speech Communication

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
115 Bingham Hall 007 A
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

STEVEN D. DOLLEY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
TOURNAMENTS THIS YEAR: 8 (up to Districts)

I see debate as a structured academic game, the goals of which are self-actualization, enjoyment, and personal realization of "truth." What makes debate uniquely able to pursue these goals is its dynamism. Therefore, I impose invariably only those rules necessary to keep the frame itself from breaking down: prep time; evidence ethics; length, number, and order of speeches. What follows after that is personal beliefs and preferences, not rules.

TOPICALITY: I believe an affirmative plan should fall within the resolution. What definitions we use to delineate the topic, and standards for them, should be articulated in the round. I believe reasonableness has been misleadingly maligned by a number of critics, as well as abused by affs. Should you prove your definition appropriate for this linguistic and situational context, it will most likely pass muster with me. I feel the topic functions as the test for an acceptable plan, and after that is determined debate focuses on that specific plan. Hence, CP topicality is irrelevant, and counterwarrants/justification worse than meaningless.

COUNTERPLANS: The link is competitiveness. The test is: Is adoption of the counterplan alone more desirable than adoption of the aff plan alone, both plan and CP, or some synthesis of portions thereof? Permutations serve as a useful test of artificial competitiveness, though they should not involve alteration of the affirmative plan. I guess it all boils down to net benefits.

CONDITIONALITY: My views on this are in flux. I accept it absent conflicting argument. In the presence of conflict, I decide based on the arguments presented. My inclination - and this is somewhat new for me - is that one well-developed, relatively consistent (at least evidentially), conditional CP is probably not an unfair, insuperable burden on the aff. YOU MAKE THE ARGUMENTS, THOUGH!

LINKS: Why have we forgotten them? One element of risk is probability. A meatball may apply, but if it doesn't, and that's well-explained, I won't assign "risk" absent probability. On the other hand, I won't ignore links that are well-explained and defended.

The best debaters, like the best people in all walks of life, are courteous and considerate to their colleagues, opponents, and judges. Rudeness and ad hominem never help, and often hurt, your persuasiveness. Also, remember that debate is a game, but the issues are not. As Bob Branham put it, "casual advocacy of oppression and genocide for strategic advantage" does not become the concerned intellectual. I'm not saying you have to believe every argument you make. Just think a little about the implications of what you're saying before you do so. We are all responsible for your ideas, as well as those we borrow and present as our own.

Debate well and fairly, and, despite the fact that this is a big tournament and the pressure is on, enjoy this weekend with your friends.

NAMASTÉ!

Steve Dolley

Marie Dzuris - OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Debate Coach - Years of Coaching - 5
Number of Tournaments This Year - 3

1. PARADIGM - I am open to any paradigm, as long as it is defended. It is up to the debaters to tell me how to resolve the round and what ground rules I should use. I will not apply arguments and evidence for the debaters. I expect them to assess their arguments and make the appropriate applications. I have very litte sympathy for the "punishment paradigm". If an argument is really that bad you should be able to be it without whining.

2. TOPICALITY - I am very liberal and give the affirmative a lot of leeway, providing they can defend their definitions. When topicality is muddled (which is almost always), I'll give the affirmative the benefit of the doubt. I do not like one-line topicality arguments. It is a cheap shot that is generally a waste of time. This does not mean that the Aff. can slight them completely. Extratopicality and how it is argued by the debaters. Better definitions are not very persuasive to me, as I see no way to make such a determination.

3. COUNTERPLANS - The relevant issue here is competition. The 'A-Z' competition is not persuasive. If the counterplan is competitive, it should not take 26 standards to point that out. How a topical counterplan is handled should be argued by the debaters. In general, I will not automatically throw out the counterplan if it is topical. I see permutation arguments as strong arguments for the affirmative. I view them as a 'test' of competition.

4. ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO - All of these seem to be good techniques and can be used quite effectively. The only standard I apply to the aff. is that the 2AR disco should not be so new that the 2NR could not have anticipated it.

5. STYLE - I expect the debaters to be professional at all times; in and out of the round. I see no reason for obnoxious behavior in a round and will dock points significantly for such actions. I will not read an unlimited amount of evidence after the round. The debaters must apply the evidence and tell me why is is important. It is not my job to decide where it fits into the debate. Most of the time, you don't want me making that determination any way. I do not object to speed. I object to incomprehensibility and will give points accordingly.

Douglas Duke
Central State University
Coached: 27 years
Judged on this topic: 10 tournaments; 56 rounds

TOPICALITY: I find topicality a difficult and distasteful issue to vote for in the debate. I find it, in most instances, to be a value judgement that I am left to 'decide' on whether the case falls clearly within the realm of the topic or not. A negative should not leave that interpretation up to me, because in most instances, I will give leeway to the affirmative and not vote for the negative topicality position. This does no give the affirmative an opportunity to run anything they desire. I will vote on topicality if the standards are clearly established and the violation(s) are clearly demonstrated to be an outgrowth of the violation of the standards. I really am not open to an indepth debate over whether topicality is / is not a voting issue. I percieve it to be an apriori argument. If topicality is lost, that justifies the decision.

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: I prefer fo view myself as an informed decision maker evaluating the merits of two competing policies. The negative should provide a consistent position which I can weigh against the affirmative. I am willing to operate in other paradigms. The debater should provide a justification for the other paradigms. The debaters have the option to argue and justify the theoretical basis for the debate. This should be clear and justified. Basically at the end of the debate, I weigh the risk of the disadvantage(s) to the impact of the affirmative.

Inherency: While I do think that some of the traditional issues are often over looked for more "sophisticated" and "current" interpretations, I can't remember how long it has been since I heard and/or voted for inherency. I won't say I wouldn't vote for inherency arguments, but I probably would not waste time with the argument.

COUNTERPLANS: I have no objections to counterplans. I do think it is an acceptable and desirable position for the advocate to take. Counterplans, for me, need to nontopical and competitive. The most acceptable standards for me to consider competitiveness is either through net benefits or mutual exclusivity. I prefer that counterplans remain in the debate, but if negatives win the conditionality positions, I am willing to accept and listen to conditional counterplans. Whereas I recognize the multiple counterplan strategies, I don't care for it. In most instances the debate bogs down into weakly organized and developed positions, the debate would benefit from more thoroughly developed positions that are well defended.

CONCERNS: The debater needs to be comprehensible. When the debater can't be understood, the arguments never get registered on the flow and wasted time and effort results for the debater and the judge. I think the debater should synthesize arguments and weight arguments. Don't assume that I will draw the same conclusions you desire for me to.

Kathleen Edelmayer
Assistant Debate Coach
Number of Tournaments: 7

Central Michigan
One Year Coaching

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: Basically I look at the round as the debaters tell me. However, if they don't weigh the issues in the round, I look at policies in a cost-benefit manner. Punnishment paradigm is not usually a very pursuasive argument. If, however, there is good analysis and good examples of how the team is abusive then I may be pursuaded to vote on the issue. Often times the time spent whining about arguments is enough time to answer the arguments. Arguments must be just that, arguments. Tag lines are not arguments. Positions must be clear when they are presented. Don't wait until 2NR/2AR to explain positions. Speed is fine as long as it is not incomprehensible. I'll only write down answers in c-x if it was my fault that I missed it. Generic disads are fine as long as there is some link to the case. That does not always mean that evidence needs to be specific although that increases the credibility. Analysis is NOT dead! Debaters should weigh the DAs against case advantages. Rarely is a meet-need absolute *NOR* can the significance be minimized to nothing.

TOPICALITY: This is always a voting issue. Otherwise, why have a resolution? However, just because it is a VI does not mean that if you just throw violations out you'll win. Negative must completely explain violations, why their definition should be used, why the aff def is inappropriate, and how the aff does not meet the neg's definition. Extra-topicality is looked at by how the debaters tell me...sever, voting issue, etc. Just make your position and justification for your position clear.

COUNTERPLANS: Mutual exclusivity and net benefits are the standards. They must be non-topical just as affs must be topical. Government counterplans are not my favorite although I still look at the arguments in the round.

ADD-ONS/TAS/DISCOS: Turnarounds must meet the same criteria as other aff advantages. Taglines will not do. Add-ons must be in 2AC and be completely developed. Discos are OK. They should be presented before 2AR to give the negative some warning and some chance to respond.

OTHERS: Debate is an activity, not a chore. Don't act as though it is a chore. Debate is still a communication activity hence, communicate to me, not just the floor. Humor is more than encouraged. Have fun and good luck.

Judging Philosophy

Rich Edwards
Georgia State University

Years of Coaching: 15
Number of Tournaments Judged This Year: 7

Decision Paradigm: When unaided by the persuasive suggestions of debaters, I see myself as a *policy-maker*. Implicit in this paradigm is that the decision will go to the team offering the policy which has the most sizeable net increment of advantage. In this scheme, workability/solvency arguments may be useful in limiting the size of the affirmative advantage to something which disadvantages can outweigh; it would rarely happen, however, that a decision would be made for the negative solely on the basis of workability/solvency arguments. Inherency arguments would seldom be determinative by themselves, but might become the opening for the negative team to defend a sub-resolutional policy which could be shown to be as desirable as the affirmative policy. In order to compensate for the affirmative bias of the policy-making paradigm, presumption remains, for me, a viable concept. Presumption resides with the negative team for issues other than topicality; should the negative policy seem to me equally as desirable as the affirmative, I will vote negative.

Topicality: I have voted negative on topicality four times this year. I am very reluctant to use this "blunt instrument" against an affirmative team unless it seems to me that the negative team has clearly won a violation of one of the terms of the resolution. I do, however, regard topicality as an independent voting issue. If the negative team establishes a standard for definition and demonstrates that plan simply fails to meet this standard in the case of at least one word in the resolution, then the negative team wins the debate.

Counterplans: I like counterplans; good affirmative teams typically choose to attack a portion of status quo policy which is difficult to defend in its present form. The counterplan is an appropriate vehicle to force a determination of whether the resolution is the best reaction to a problem. Unless the teams persuasively argue otherwise, my decision relative to the counterplan will employ the following standards. First, the counterplan must be nonresolutional. Competition may be established either through net benefits or mutual exclusivity. If the affirmative team asks that competition be rejected because of a permutation, that permutation should embody both the net benefits and the mutual exclusivity test. The permutation must be shown to be include within one policy the essential elements of the plan and the counterplan and it must be shown to subsume (or achieve in the same degree) the net benefit advantage of the counterplan. Permutations which suggest time differentials ("first do the counterplan, then later do the plan") seem to me abusive. I carry no bias for or against change of government counterplans; they must meet the same burdens that other counterplans must meet.

Style: Speed is not the issue here; *comprehensibility* is vital. If the debater has sufficient articulation skill to be clearly understood even while speaking rapidly, then speed is not a problem. Judges cannot, however, be mind-readers. The rebuttal speeches (especially the final two rebuttals) should give clear emphasis to the key issues that the debater wishes to see as determinative.

Miscellaneous Comments: NDT debate should be an enjoyable activity even as it challenges the participants. It should go without saying that the debater should display common courtesy in dealing with other teams, with his or her partner, and with judges. As a judge, my primary commitment is to provide a decent, courteous, and educationally-beneficial interaction with debaters.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY OF GREGG FISHBEIN
Ex-Debater, University of Northern Iowa---2 Tournaments 1986-87

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: Much to the dismay of my old coaches, I don't have any pre-set judging philosophy. I'm not a hypo-tester, policy maker, or critic of argument. I'm a judge. If you have something to say, I feel that I have an obligation to listen. If you tell me how to evaluate the arguments in a round I will do my best to follow your instructions. If you don't tell me then you leave your fate in my hands to evaluate the arguments as I see fit. Talk to me and I will usually listen and obediently follow your instructions.

TOPICALITY: I really enjoy this argument. However, I don't like poorly argued topicality. If you want to argue it, that's fine with me. But please, spend some time with it and develop it well. I don't really get wrapped up in standards. Give them if you want but I think that the real debate and clash should be on the violations. I usually give the affirmative some presumption on this but lots of credibility goes to the negative if they spend a large amount of time on it. I think that it's a voting issue but almost never (unless abused severely) a reverse voter.

COUNTERPLANS: I also like these. Multiple counterplans are fine but I would prefer to see it kept under five per round. I will accept just about any legitimate standard of competition. I do believe that permutations are a legitimate test of counterplan competition. I think that counterplans should be non-topical but I will listen to arguments to the contrary. I may be old-fashioned here but I really think that a counterplan should gain the affirmative advantage before it works on other advanatges. Counterplans can be conditional.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: Go for it. Those of you who knew me when I debated know that I always had partners who would do lots of disco. While I would never do something like that, I encourage you to do that kind of stuff. I think that 2AR is a bit late for this type of activity unless there is ample warning before it happens. Turns can either be evidenced, explained, or pulled from 1AC. Disco is the one aspect of debate that really shows that you are thinking. Granting PMAs to take out DAs, jettisoning plan mandates, granting counterplans, using DA answers to get links to another DA are all examples of what I think are excellent disco strategies. The only thing that I caution you on is that you better make sure I understand what you are doing.

MISCELLANEOUS RAMBLINGS: I have not judged a lot of college rounds this year. I don't know in depth a lot of the arguments that are familiar to all of you. Watch use of abbreviations. However, I am a law student so I do have that background which I will use to relate to this topic. That means you shouldn't argue something that a lay person might understand but a law student would know is wrong. I was a former 1N. That means two things. First, I love to hear case argued well and extended through rebuttals. Second, I dislike 2NRs that don't collapse to a few issues and who don't extend well-argued 1N positions. I enjoy people who talk fast but I dislike people who think that they can talk fast but are incomprehensible. If I don't understand it, I probably won't flow it or vote on it. I will usually look at key cards after the debate. If there is something that you specifically want me to see, you should let me know.

All of the above things are my predispositions. As I said before, I will listen to what you have to say. I'm not bound by everything that I said but when you allow, I will use those guidelines to judge rounds. GOOD LUCK TO ALL!!!!!

Lee Fitzpatrick, Mercer University

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I consider myself a policymaker and will employ that paradigm unless given a reason not to by the debaters in the round. I feel that the judge's role is to determine whether a harmful situation (or risk of one) exists and to evaluate which of several competing systems best solves that problem with the least risk of additional harmful consequences. I will adopt other paradigms as instructed in the round. I don't like theoretical arguments but realize that they are a necessary evil. My minimum criteria for theory arguments is that they have some reason given as to why they should be adopted and that they be explained (especially if it's something weird!). If given good reason I'll punish, but my predisposition is that not voting for the argument is punishment enough.

TOPICALITY: I have strict standards for topicality. The nature of topicality as a "subjective" issue requires that the argument be well explained when initially presented. I give little credence to a blurted out, 30 second T argument. Topicality must have standards, definitions (it amazes me that some teams assert definitions) and, most importantly, reasons why the aff does not meet the standards/definitions. Many negatives just assume that the reason why the plan does not meet their definition is obvious. Often it is not, and I will not make assumptions for the negative (or the aff if they are guilty) since there is no way the other side can guess what I think an unexplained argument means. As for other standards I have no predisposition and feel they are debatable issues. I think T is a voting issue although I can be persuaded otherwise. I lean aff on T and the more confused the issue becomes, the less likely I am to vote on it--so if you want my vote on topicality, be CLEAR!

COUNTERPLANS: They're fine. I personally believe that mutual exclusivity and net benefits are the only true competitiveness standards, but I'll listen to and vote on others. I believe there is a point where the number of counterplans makes rational evaluation of the alternatives difficult (due to lack of depth). The greater the number of counterplans, the higher the burden of explanation I put on the negative and the more latitude I give to the aff. I think "permutation" is nothing more than another way to claim that the CP is artificially competative and find nothing wrong with the argument although I require the aff to explain the nature of the permutation they propose (i.e. what specifically does the aff propose to change).

ADD-ONS/TURNS/DISCO: I see nothing wrong with add-ons and turns. However, turns should really turn something and not be just a label. As for disco, it would be the ultimate double standard for me not to allow it. There should be some forwarning in 1AR (unless the disco stems from a 2NR answer, in which case I think it's 2NR's tough luck if he gives 2AR an out).

STYLE: Debaters who are obnoxious and/or make no attempt to be comprehensible will lose points. I try to make faces or pick up my pen to give some sign when these problems occur. If I can't flow it, I won't vote on it so make sure you are communicating. I DO look at evidence. CX is binding. I don't think you're obligated to give away future positions in CX, but over evasiveness does not impress me and I'll give the other team extra leeway when interpreting these areas if you fail to answer. Finally, I think debate is a fun activity and any attempt to add to the enjoyment of a round probably has a tendency to subliminally influence me.

1986 Statement

Keith D. Freadhoff
University of Southern California

Third year coaching
7 tournaments

Paradigm: I will judge in any paradigm argued in the round. If no paradigm is offered I evaluate the round from a "policy-making" perspective. As a "policy-maker" I will compare advantages, disadvantages, and any counterplans offered in the round. I will vote on "stock issues" such as inherency, solvency or significance if the negative advances these issues. Although this year I haven't heard a round where the negative has made a serious attempt to win one of these issues.

Topicality: Topicality is always a voting issue. I expect negatives to present criterion for evaluating topicality, including standards and violations. "Best definition" is the standard I prefer and usually hear in rounds, but negatives usually blip out the argument, and never explain how the affirmative doesn't meet the definition, or how their interpretations are the "best." I give affirmatives "leeway" on topicality because it is a no-risk issue for negatives, but I think "reverse voter" is a silly argument and I won't vote for it. Topicality should be presented in the first negative.

Counterplans: I don't like conditional counterplans, or counterplans that are competitive at the resolutional level. I prefer counterplans that rely on being "mutually exclusive" to be competitive. "Net-benefits" are O.K., but most teams I've heard this year make a mess out of this standard. Topicality standards negatives present with the counterplan should be consistent other topicality standards negative may be arguing in the round. I think the use of permutations by the affirmative are a good way to evaluate if a counterplan is competitive.

Style: I don't like obnoxious or rude debaters. I will make a reasonable attempt to get arguments down on my flow, but I won't kill myself trying to get arguments down that are incomprehensible when presented. I expect debaters to <u>explain</u> the arguments they want me to vote on. I dislike "team" cross examination, and I will stop the practice.

Jon P. Frenza
Assistant Debate Coach
7 tournaments

Wayne State University
One year Coaching

After having witnessed this "debate process thang" from afar I am throughly convinced that there are but a few judges who actually base their decision calculus on what they have transcribed in the monolithic "NDT Judging Philosophy Booklet." So why waste the time? Perhaps an even better question comes to mind-why waste the paper? I should think that I can make better use of this 8½ by 11 by conveying to you, the debater , the latest top ten list form the home box office in Detroit.

But so as not to enrage the serious debate geek-let me dispose of a brief summary/commentary about me as a judge. Basically I try to be as fair as humanly possible. That is the bottom line. I will work as hard as I can to listen to all the arguments presented and make as fair and unbiased assessment of the round as possible. It doesnt matter to me what the argument, which school, what your dressed like, or what your on at the time. I'll do the best that I can. God that's mighty noble of me, eh? Sincerly though, you wont get repped out of the room. If you dont like my decision-deal with it-it means you werent convincing enough-that is your fault. The integrity part is my contribution-and that is all that I have to say about that... and still with two thirds of a page to babble mindlessly...

Back to more serious matters. A top ten list of my all time favorite debaters. Your probably sitting there going oh-well lets read this later we've got to deal with this guy as a judge for the next hour-but of course the debater that can manage to include some element of each of these debaters style-will win my ballot and get a thirty-the consequence of course will be that you'll lose the other two judges. That is a certainty. So the list goes like this: 1) Scott Forester-because pride and integrity still have a place in this mad, zany activity. 2) Jeff LaFave-partially makes the list because he's no longer wearing outfits like white shoes, pink shirts and bright yellow ties-thank god for that ugly chapter in fashion history coming to a close. But seriously, LaFave because he still has a hungry desire to win-god bless his opponents-not to mention poor old Jeff Leon. 3) John Doran-only because he debated like one should live life-doing the same thing until it hurts. 4) Glen Graham-the quiet talent who impressed me the most. 5) Ouita Papka-because class is too small a word for some people. 6) Lynn Robbins-partially because he looks like the stay puff marshmellow man and partially because he deserves all the success he gets-even if it means stealing it from LaFave. 7) Bill Shanahan-because life needs people like him and also whats a little anarchy amongst friends? 8) Mark Whitehead-because I say so-and which of you debate wimps wants to be caught in a dark alley arguing with me? 9) Dan "Alien Farm" Hintz-because he out poved the pove-and understands the philosophy behind bite your lip. Finally, 10) A combination of one-half Ted Bixby and one-half John Delicath-because hardcore has a future in an activity that at this time is drowing with geeks. Remember guys-death before dishonor.

Sorry Lucas-you make the top spot on another lost list that I think you know is far more important-We killed like champions didnt we?

Not making the list but deserving of announcement-jaffe and Mahoney and Budner-wierd folks from a wierd place but interestingly nice nonetheless, Everyone at Northwestern-Kathy, Ben Julie, and Les-too bad your sports teams suck, Greco and Rogers-who probably have only one lung between them, Damus-because of a nasty folk song, and Peter Ferguson-who I relinquish my crown of chick magnet to.

Well I'd really like to continue on but I have some inherency arguments to crank out for my boss-in closing please remember-debate is supposed to be fun-hardcore at that-I learned well from my coach Bear-so relax and have a good time-watch out for Harris on the basketball court and look for me-I'll be in good company-aint that right Holly?

AMY LEE FUGATE JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
YEARS COACHING: 7 NUMBER OF NDT TOURNAMENTS: 7

TOPICALITY: I find myself voting more on this issue (for the negative) this year than in past years. I attribute this to arguments which are structured with the standards and violations relating to one another as opposed to a list of internally contradictory standards and then meaningless violations. This is an apriori issue when making a decision in the round.

PARADIGM: While I will listen to argumentation for various paradigms, I generally fall into the catagory of a policy maker; i.e. weighing the case advantages against disadvantages. However, the affirmative still has the burden to prove the inherent nature of the advantages as well as solvency. On this topic, inherency doesn't seem to present much of a problem but solvency has become a very viable negative attack. Negative disadvantages which have more than a "generic" link are certainly appreciated!

COUNTERPLANS: I have not heard many counterplans argued on this topic. I have no objection to them as long as they are not topical and are competitive with the affirmative case. I do not like counterplans whose sole purpose is to make the disadvantages unique and I think competitivness with these counterplans is harder to defend. Counterplans which enact through another ammendment can certainly be argued as topical. I prefer hearing a structured counterplan to a justification argument which merely hints at a counterplan.

COUNTERWARRANTS: While I have voted on these in the past, it has been in cases where the affirmative team's case has justified this line of argumentation. If they are run, they need to be defended not only theoretically but in light of the affirmative case.

EVIDENCE STANDARDS: I will uphold the AFA guidelines if evidence is challenged for both teams. I enjoy hearing teams who take the time to indict evidence specifics as opposed to a card war leaving me to sort it all out in the end. I will read evidence only if I feel it is necessary to aid in my decision making process.

CROSS-EXAMINATION: Answers given in cross-x should be given by the person to whom the question is addressed! The answers are binding but need to be used within arguments developed in the following speeches to have much impact.

STYLE: In the past few months I have found myself defending the speed of NDT debate as a necessity due to the number of sophisticated arguments. As long as I can understand these, the speed is not a problem. However, I will not hesitate to let you know when your clarity is in jeopardy. It is also easier for me to listen to only one member of a team at a time both during speeches and during cross-examination. I have yet to hear a rational for rudeness in debate rounds and teams who spoil a round in this way will usually note my displeasure in speaker points. Likewise, debaters who enjoy themselves and the round make it a pleasure for me to be there and find positive rewards on their ballot!

Paul Gaither
7 years judging

Houston Baptist Univ.
5 tournaments

Debaters should be aware that as a peripheral minion of the debate world, I haven't listened to a tremendous number of rounds this year. Thus I tend to place a lot of responsibility on the debaters to isolate clearly defined positions on which they expect me to vote. I find that the more removed I become from the debate "mainstream," the less likely I am to vote on unexplained positions, one-word flips and tenuous cross-applications. I do try to let the debaters dictate the argumentative and theoretical constructs of the debate, but it helps if they make the effort to fill me in on what they're doing in the process.

To be perfectly honest, I seldom vote negative on topicality. When I do, it's usually because the affirmative has tragically mishandled or simply missed negative analysis. I hear too many negative topicality arguments consisting of two-word-tag standards that are never related to the subsequent violations(that are usually based on non-exclusive definitions). In other words, I tend to give the affirmative a lot of leeway on the issue. I generally subscribe to the concept that the affirmative need only be one reasonable interpretation of the resolution and that it's hard to prove that someone's interpretation is unreasonable. I also think punishing negative teams with reverse voters is patently absurd.

Teams are free to argue for the application of any decision-making paradigm they prefer. Such arguments will be evaluated as issues and the resulting paradigm will be used in deciding the round. In the absence of such preferential paradigm pleading, I'll judge the round as a comparison of significance between--or among--the policy options presented. Quantitative significance is always nice, but qualitative impacts may certainly prove compelling, especially on rights-oriented topics such as this. In either case, links to significance should be strong and specific in order for me to evaluate the amount of significance generated by an advantage, disad, or flip.

I have no particular biases against counterplans. I believe that they should force a choice when I compare them to the affirmative plan and my views on how they do that are fairly traditional. Agent counterplans don't raise any flags in my predispositions--just make sure the approach is consistent with the rest of what is done on the negative.

People who abuse each other in cross-ex don't do much for me. By this point in the year I expect people to know enough about their respective positions that I consider cross-ex answers to be binding within the round.

I do read evidence after rounds, but only when I feel I really need to for my own clarification. Time spent imploring me to 'read a card after the round' would be better spent explaining to me the problem with the card. I try to listen closely to and flow the body of the card. As such, I take most tag lines with a grain of salt and am usually aware of massively overclaimed evidence. My views on evidence challenges are traditional.

If there are other things you want to know--ask.

N.D.T. JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Eric Gander
Northwestern University
50 or so rounds judged this year
4 years coaching

I don't really consider myself a policy maker or a hypo-tester in a debate round. If the debaters want to persuade me that I should be one or the other (or both), or something else altogether, that is fine with me however. Basically, though, I like hearing debate rounds in which all the participants articulate well thought-out arguments, read some cards, and think in rebuttals. That about sums up my judging "philosophy." The rest of what I have to say merely clarifies some of my preferences; as far as what I will or will not listen to, however, essentially I'll entertain any arguments the debaters wish to advance.

The question of whether judges should or should not intervene in debate rounds seems to be something of a hot issue these days. My own view is that judges should not intervene, if by intervention one means something like, "imposing one's preference for certain arguments on the debaters." My answer to those who say that judges should not listen to arguments that are morally repugnant, patiently stupid, and so forth, is that, if debate is anything, it should be a forum for training future advocates to explain why arguments are repugnant, stupid, and the like. There would, I think, be little educational value to this activity if judges, on their own volition, were to throw out particular arguments, rather than make the debaters deal with all types of issues. On the other hand, I don't think that judges cannot not intervene, if by intervention one means something like, "imposing some coherent pattern on the arguments presented." So, if you want to win, give me a coherent pattern, in rebuttals, upon which I can impose the arguments in the round.

Topicality is another issue about which there is some degree of controversy within the debate community. As far as I am concerned, if both teams wish to argue a case which appears to have little to do with the topic, I will have no problems leaving aside the issue of the topicality altogether. When topicality is argued, I expect the team which advances the argument to set forth well developed standards, to clearly indicate how the opposing team violates these standards, and, if challenged, to explain why topicality should be a voting issue.

As far as counterplans are concerned, the competitiveness standard which makes the most sense to me is net benifits. I am open to affirmative permutation arguments, and arguments on "artifical" competitiveness. As for everything else, I have no problems with add-ons, turnarounds, and the like.

Lastly, a word on style. It should be obvious, but I'll say it anyway: debaters should only speak as fast as they are able to be understood clearly; when in doubt, err on the side of clarity. I may call for evidence after the round, but never if it was read incomprehensibly. To me, all cross examination periods are important, and should consist of more than merely the wholesale exchange of evidence between the debaters. Finally--and let me make this perfectly clear--I hate obnoxious debaters. If you don't have the arguments and analysis to win the round, insulting the other team and/or me, won't help you at all.

I do not wish to end on that note, however. The most important point I want to make, is that I understand and can appreciate the significant amount of time and energy most debaters put into the activity. I shall try to reciprocate this level of commitment by judging each round as carefully and conscientiously as I am able.

PAT GANER
Director of Forensics

Cypress College
16 years of coaching
7 Tournaments judged this year

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: Left to my own, I would consider myself a policy-maker within the framework of a critic of argument. I consider the standard stock issues of significance, inherency, solvency and disadvantages as they affect policy considerations. I consider all of the above. All too often, teams underutilize the first three for the sake of concentrating on the last one. I am not impressed with mega-DAs, particularly when they are generics, and I do not vote on them simply because they are claimed. If the affirmative convinces me that the links are weak, I turn my attention to the other stock issues.

TOPICALITY: Because I see debate primarily as a means of training people to function better in the "real world," I dislike teams who want to play it as a game totally divorced from "reality." Thus, I will vote against an affirmative that has carved a case out of an area that is clearly not topical. By the same token, I dislike negatives who scream "topicality" at the drop of a hat, even when the case is clearly topical. I am not impressed with arguments that are merely "time sucks." If topicality is worth running, it is worth running well. While debaters can set the standards in the round for what constitutes a better definition, it should be obvius that I personally prefer the "reasonable man [sic]" standard. In terms of extratopicality, I simply disregard the extratopical provisions of the plan.

COUNTERPLANS: I have no objection to counterplans per se but I dislike seeing them used because teams do not want to--or cannot--clash with the affirmative case. I am not fond of conditional counterplans; either argue the CP or don't. Because I feel presumption shifts to the affirmative in a CP round, the negative CP must gain all of the affirmative advantages and some additional ones. Negatives must prove the CP is nontopical, competitive (as above) and mutually exclusive but I expect to see some analysis on those items and not just blurbs of dozens of subpoints. I am not known as a fan of counterwarrants.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: I have no object to add-ons; arguments can be introduced at any point in the constructive speeches. I am becoming far less tolerant of turnarounds for two reasons: 1) They are frequently unnecessary. Often it would make sense to defeat the DA head-on. I would rather see a team think about the assumptions of the DA rather than just try to flip everything in sight. 2) They are frequently counterproductive. I dislike hearing specious TAs as counters to specious DAs. When that happens, I find myself upset at both teams rather than at just one. With respect to "discoing," I'd rather watch John Travolta do it in Saturday Night Fever than watch debaters do it in a round. Far too often, the fancy footwork masks an inability to do the fundamental steps pertaining to analysis and reasoning.

STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES: I have no objection to speed but I do object to incomprehensibility. I will not read evidence after a round and I dislike it when teams have to rely on finding out what was said in the round by asking for copies of briefs, asking questions in prep time, etc. Too often, excess speed is present because debaters are concerned with the quantity of arguments rather than the quality of them; I am not. I would rather hear a team isolate and analyze the critical arguments than one that dumps dozens of far-fetched arguments and hundreds of pieces of evidence, none of which are ever explained or analyzed.

Rey Garcia
Southwest Texas State University
Four years coaching
Judged at 7 tournaments this year

1. TOPICALITY: Topicality is a voting issue, you will have a hard time convincing me otherwise. You will also have a hard time convincing me it should be a voting issue against the negative. I'm not partial to "T" arguments thrown at me at hyper-speed, sans explanation. "T" debates should focus on the violation. Standards rarely influence my decision on a topicality argument. 1AR's get leeway in answering 2N topicality arguments.

2. DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: I'm a debate coach. I evaluate the issues in the debate by comparing arguments and evidence. Paradigmatic arguments (i.e., judicial paradigm) are subject to the same scrutiny. If you want me to make my decision using a certain framework you have to give me good reasons why I should. Absent rebuttal from the opposition I will probably do as you wish.

3. INHERENCY: This is the forgotten first negative argument. There are a few cases this year that beg for it. If you run it well I can be convinced to vote for it. However, don't expect leeway on disadvantage links.

4. SIGNIFICANCE: Have some. I would like 2NR and 2AR to provide some standards for weighing qualitative versus quantitative impacts. Why are rights more important than New Right backlash?

5. CROSS-EXAMINATION: Please ask questions! I get very bored and angry when C-X time is spent asking for answers. If I can flow, so can you. I loathe tag-team C-X.

6. EVIDENCE STANDARDS: Why is evidence from a second-year law student better qualified than the justices on the courts that hear these cases I'm supposed to overturn? I don't know. Maybe you can tell me. I'd be happy to listen.

7. COUNTERPLANS: I love case specific counterplans. I'm not very impressed by the generics. I'm a traditionalist in evaluating CP's. They should be non-topical and competitive (mutual exclusivity and net benefits). I hate silly competitiveness standards like: philosophy, redundancy, etc.

8. COUNTERWARRANTS: If you can support the theory you can run the argument.

9. ADD ONS, TURNAROUNDS, DISCO: Please explain these things to me. Don't claim take-out evidence as a turn. Disco in the 2AR requires some prior warning.

10. STYLE AND OTHER CONCERNS: Have style. I have grown to dislike judging debates because they are no fun. If you can't enjoy yourself in this activity maybe you're in the wrong game. Intensity is fine, but don't let it turn into rude behavior. Have fun.

Bob Garman
Augustana College, SD

2 years coaching
5 Tournaments this year

PARADIGM: I consider myself a policymaker in the sense that I will judge the debate as a comparison between two policies. The affirmative may offer their plan, the negative may defend the status quo or run a counterplan. If the cogent reasons are given why I should evaluate the debate in another way, then I will do so, however, my bias toward policy requires the team advocating the alternate paradigm have good, well-argued reasons.

CONDITIONAL ARGUMENTS: In the debate round I do not like a negative who runs several counterplans and tries to pick and choose or asks me to pick and choose. If the counterplans are truly consistent then run them as 1 counterplan, if they are inconsistent then choose before the round. I find severability arguments in the plan to be just as conditional and just as unacceptable. I am easily persuaded by good arguments that conditional arguments are illegitimate and that their introduction into the debate round by the other team is a voting issue, regardless of abuse. As with topicality, I don't think that this is a reverse voting issue unless the team initiating it runs conditional arguments also.

TOPICALITY: Topicality is an issue which I do not like to evaluate. I require the affirmative to be reasonable, the explanation of which occurs in the debate. Topicality is **always** a voting issue and is **never** a reverse voting issue.

COUNTERPLANS: I am very strict on counterplan competitiveness. I believe that the counterplan must be mutually exclusive or net beneficial. Competition does not come from non-essential parts of the plan, but from the inability of the advantage producing parts of the plan and the counterplan to co-exist either physically or beneficially. Permutations is a method to evaluate the competitiveness of the counterplan. Permutations are not plan amendments and are not conditional arguments. Some explanation of what the supposed permutations are must be given by the affirmative, the word itself has no meaning.

DISADS: LINK. Remember that word? It still retains importance to some judges. I happen to be one of those judges. (Probably a product of being indoctrinated by dinosaurs.) They need not be absolute, but they must be plausible and evidence is very helpful to credibility. Specific cards exist for most every case, find them. Also, there is a minimum risk that must exist. While it is not quantifiable in numbers, the plausibility must exist or I will not evaluate the impacts, no matter how large. Intrinsicness arguments are as yet a mystery to me. How the hell do they get evaluated? They are not plan amendments, so I don't think they are conditional. I am unclear how the affirmative can say that we can minor repair the status quo later, we are debating the case now. If they are ever explained to me theoretically in a debate why they are good, I may accept them, but I will be difficult to persuade.

ETC: Counterwarrants and Hasty generalization arguments are for those who fear research, links and analysis -- they are very easy to dismiss on a theoretical level. I flow reasonably well if comprehensible. I can think a little (I was allowed to retain some of my programming from when I was a 1A-1N), but on unique or intricate arguments, some explaining is helpful. Falsified or grossly out-of-context evidence is a voting issue, as are unproveable charges of such.

S. M. Garmon West Georgia College

I'm the only one I know who would rather view perms as actually adding a CP portion to aff's plan, rather than as merely a test of competition (a related eccentricity is that I think x-top plan planks become the property of both teams rather than of neither). Policy must be presented in your first stand on the floor--after that you may add policy to your plan only if it is introduced by the other team (EX: 2AC can add "feed-the-world" to aff's plan only if a 1NC CP "feeds-the world.") Intrinsicness: I have come to see the opposing plans as the best focus for debate (with the topic serving only to divide ground). At the same time, policy does not occur in a vaccuum--when Congress (the courts, whoever), sees a problem emerging as a result of a plan, they sometimes take steps to prevent the DA. In my experience, though, DA answers of the type, "[some agent] would respond to the threat of this DA by [some action]" are underutilized. But this is not to say that "DAs must be intrinsic." The difference is that I see the liklihood that the agent actually would take whatever action as open to debate, whereas the intrinsicness requirement would allow aff to say only that such action should or could happen.

I have no problem with multiple conditional CPs, but another argument I think affs underutilize is that two CPs may compete with each other: CP X may be a reason to reject CP Y. Moreover, CP X would still exist as a reason to reject CP Y even if neg ceased defending CP X--just as, when aff answers a DA by granting a link and running only impact flips, neg can't say "we withdraw our link."

Fiat: I think debate could get along quite well without this word. "Should-would" gives us all we need and avoids confusion about "fiat abuse."

I think aff's burden is no more or less than to defend the position that: "If, by some fluke, some relevant agent(s) were, of their own free will, to decide to curtail or prohibit one or more presently existing restrictions, etc., then that would be good." So aff usurps no one's authority and forces no one to do anything.

I view CPs that do not utilize the same agent as the affirmative as rarely competitive and, even if they are, I would rather the debate focused on what some agent should do, rather than on which agent should be the one to act.

Policy presumptions: I hold a presumption in favor of status quo purposes, but not for status quo methods or conditions. This means that common-sense Western values, e.g. economic growth, increases in life span, reduction of nuclear weapons, expansion of individual freedom, democracy, etc., are all, in moderate amounts, presumed good. Feel free to oppose these values, but I place the burden of proof on you if you do so.

A final note: Due, no doubt, to advancing mental retardation, I take a rotten flow. And the tags I don't get don't count. If no one is clear in rebuttals, I shall feel uncomfortable about my decision whichever way I vote. In a feeble attempt to compensate for my (almost always) inadequate flow and your (sometimes) inadequate comprehensibility, I often call for a lot of cards--sometimes all of them--and reconstruct the round myself. Forewarned is forearmed. Maybe.

Robert H. Gass
Director of Forensics, Cal State Fullerton
11 years of coaching, 9 tournaments judged at this year

PARADIGM: I tend to think of myself as a debate judge when judging debates. This statement may seem self-evident, however, a number of my colleagues appear to be disenchanted with their roles as "mere debate judges" and are willing to go to extraordinary lengths to pretend they are someone they are not. If both teams agree to share the same fantasy, then I will don the black robe of a Supreme Court justice, the white lab coat of a hypothesis tester, the grey flannel suit of a policy maker, or the loud plaid coat of a game show host. Meanwhile, back in reality, my preference is for this to be a debate round, for you to be debaters, and for me to be a debate judge.

CONDITIONAL ARGUMENTS: I don't like conditional arguments. No, make that I really don't like conditional arguments. Better yet, make that I really, really don't like conditional arguments.

MR. T: I think the large majority of cases I've heard on this year's topic are topical. If the affirmative can identify a specific (federal) court case and show that free speech/press concerns comprised part of the court's rationale--majority or minority opinion--I tend to be satisfied. I'm not firmly convinved that all symbolic expression, e.g., conduct and behavior, constitute "free speech," so cards saying "This is too speech!" would be helpful on the Aff. On the Neg., If you've really got something going on "T," pursue it! If you win a standard and a violation, I'll vote on it. I hate "label" debates over topicality standards,i.e., "They delimit," "No, they overlimit," "No, we increase education," "No, they decrease education," etc. One more thing, I can't recall having ever voted on "mass noun" on this or any other topic.

COUNTERPLANS: I personally feel that "mutual exclusivity" and "net benefits" are the most legitimate competitiveness standards. I tend to view other standards with suspicion, unless there is solid evidence linking a particular standard to a specific counterplan strategy. Standards such as "philosophical competitiveness" make little sense to me since, if a counterplan only competes at a philosophical level, the Aff. can enjoy all the pragmatic benefits of doing both counterplans, while the Neg. can only enjoy the advantage of philosophical consistency, which is the only advantage that would flow the competitive portions of the counterplan. There seem to be as many different interpretations of "permutations" as there are judges and debaters. I don't favor the notion that permutations are merely "tests" of competitiveness, since this tends to legitimize conditional argumentation which I disdain. I'd prefer to see Aff's advocate one consistent position, either a specific permutation or the original Aff. plan, but not a variety of undeveloped, uncertain permutations. This might appear to give the Neg. an advantage in establishing competitivenees, however, it seems unreasonable to me to ask the Neg. to defend their counterplan against a universe of possible permutations, none of which are developed or advocated by the Aff.

TURNS/ADD-ONS/DISCO: I certainly vote on turns, but the turn must be explained. I don't consider "blips" or tag lines like "C-2 takes out" to be arguments. I rarely if ever vote on cheap shots or tricks. Cross applications should be made at the soonest opportunity to do so, or at least in time for the other team to respond. That means I frown on cross applications initiated in the 2AR. You should allocate time to arguments and issues in proportion to the amount of judging consideration you wish them to receive. If you ask me after a round why I didn't vote on your 12th response, "beaten above," it's because you didn't feature it enough.

STYLE: I coached Mike Dolny for four years, so I can't be too picky about stylistic concerns. Try not to allow spittle to form on your lip and hang there for long periods of time. Don't call direct attention to your opponent's acne problem. Do try to be a nice person since, all things being equal, no one likes a jerk. If you are unintelligible or incomprehensible I will ding your speaker points.

IDIOSYNCRACIES: I like NDT debate. I'm not grumpy or cranky about the activity. I don't think every new strategy or theoretical innovation is going to destroy debate. I try not to intervene much, although if arguments and evidence are left hanging, I will search for some means of resolving the issues.

CHESTER GIBSON -- WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE

On rare occasions when I am allowed to judge a team from the University of Kansas, Professor Parson's advice to his debaters is always the same -- "In your last rebuttal, write the ballot for him". With this coaching advice, Professor Parson is doing more than just calling for clarity. However, it seems to be pretty sound advice. Most debaters are not willing to waste speaking time to provide some perspective to the hundreds of blips that we have on our flow. They reserve that for an overtime summary which I do not listen to or they provide perspective with such claims as "This round is real clear."

Since I have judged very few rounds on this years topic, I'll just list off a few items that may be of interest -- some of which are really true.

- I really do prefer a rather substantive attempt to weigh the positions argued by each team. While some decision rules are really silly and are not automatically accepted, I do prefer to hear arguments which clearly contrast the positions taken, preferably something more substantive than "We are ahead 7 wars to 4 on the flow."

- If you really believe that you can beat a team with the quality and depth of your arguments, I prefer that over strategies that attempt to throw out a maze of arguments, riddled with repetitions, assertions and unexplained tag lines. If you need the latter to win, then I'll exert every effort to try to keep up with it.

- I am wedded to no particular judging philosophy though I find it much more enjoyable to evaluate debates where issues of policy are discussed and where there is some consistency of position.

- My standards of significance for an affirmative may be a little higher than many would consider reasonable. Affirmative teams that say, in essence, "There can't be a disad to this plan because we don't do very much," run the risk that I might vote on presumption.

- I don't mind listening to well developed topicality positions. If you just flip it out as a time waster in constructives and then blow it up in rebuttals, I'm a little less sympathetic. But if you have a good position, get it out in pretty good detail, and, though the affirmative has to be given a good bit of leeway in choosing affirmative cases, there are some limits to which they must adhere.

- As long as you are clear, you can talk as fast as you want to and I'll do my best, but I think that debaters drastically overestimate the ability of most judges to clearly evaluate these rounds where teams are out of control with the number of arguments.

- I will try my best to fairly evaluate whatever arguments and strategy you adopt for the debate. Every effort will be made to render a decision without injecting my own prejudices regarding an argument though I must admit that some positions which debaters take are so counter intuitive that they are hard to vote for.

- Don't just label something a turn without clearly indicating your reasoning.

I find that many rounds that center on debates about debate or debate theory invite rather subjective evaluation. However, that may be your best option in some rounds.

Good Luck.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
KEITH T. GILBERT/H.S.U.

TOPICALITY: Considered a voting issue unless argued otherwise. Affirmative is presumed topical after 1AC. Negative should argue specific violations and standards if they wish to make topicality arguments. Absent an argument on standards, face-value/reasonability will be implied. If specific negative standards are argued, mere indictments of negative standards by the affirmative will not shift the standard to judge topicality to reasonableness unless reasonability is argued specifically and, when compared to negative standards, appears to be the superior standard.

SIGNIFICANCE: Low significance OK although should be justified.

SOLVENCY: Absolute PMA/PMN are voters. Substantial loss of solvency which reduces affirmative to low significance may be voters without affirmative justification.

DISADVANTAGES: Not necessarily a prerequisite for a negative ballot. Risk DAs should be supported as de-justification of affirmative. DAs without links are not considered "risk of" DAs. However, DAs without links that are completely dropped by the affirmative are usually not prejudged.

COUNTERPLANS: Acceptable. For non-top see TOPICALITY above. For competitiveness the negative need only compete with affirmative's actual significance and not claimed significance. For example, may "meet need" part and counterplan balance. Likewise, negative may wish to compete with affirmative by offering more than one counterplan.

THEORY ARGUMENTS: Open for debate without prejudice. Preference given to theory arguments developed with analysis and evidence. Therefore, hypos, plan amendments, binding or non-binding CX, and judging paradigm are all arguments that may be permitted.

STYLE: Only ask that presentations are clear.

GENERALLY: I prefer the affirmative to isolate a harm which topically is solvable. The negative may convince me that no harm exists or may argue a comparative policy by arguing a) the harm is justified <because of DAs> or, b) it would be superior to solve non-topically <with counterplan>.

Judging philosophy of Robert Gilmore

As I judge, I impose few, if any standards upon the debaters. Debate is for them, not me. However, a few preferences are indicated below.

Topicality is presumed to be a voter. I tend to favor the standard of Reasonability in evaluating definitions. INC is usually the fairest place to introduce this issue.

Counterplans are acceptable. Mutual Exclusivity, Net Benefits, and sometimes even the issue of philosophy make a counterplan compete. I am not a big fan of permutations, as they tend to unfairly restrict counterplan ground. Perms must be topical and should be a logical extension of the Affirmative plan. Counterplans should not be topical. Topical counterplans may become a justification for the resolution and thus equal an affirmative victory. Presumption is usually always against the reolution. 2NC counterplans are not encouraged. Conditionality is an acceptable theoretical approach in examining the positions against adapting the resolution. Aff cannot capture a counterplan, if the counterplan is truly non topical.

Inherency is rarely a voter, unless, of course, the plan has been adapted last night.

Ad-ons are certainly legitimate, turnarounds are strongly encouraged.

DAs are weighed against the Aff adavantage, if one happens before the other that certainly makes a difference.

Speed is no problem, but if I can't understand it, I can't write it down, thus I can't make it part of the outcome of the debate.

Ethics are very important. Misrepresented arguements, evidence, etc. will most likely result in the death sentence. Swearing is usually not very pleasing to hear. Everybody should be warm and fuzzy.

It is usually vital for a negative to win a DA, or counterplan, or prove that the Affirmative does not provide an example of the resolution.

JOHN GOSSETT
13 YEARS EXPERIENCE

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
JUDGED AT 6 TOURNAMENTS IN 1986-87

PARADIGM: I see myself as a trained critic who evaluates the strength of arguments within the debate format. Consequently, there are certain standards that I impose upon the advocate. For me, procedural issues (e.g. whether or not topicality is a voting issue, time limits, ethics, etc.) are not debatable, whereas substantive issues (e.g. should restrictions on 1st Amendment freedoms be curtailed) are very debateable. For me, don't waste time arguing procedural issues. Make good arguments on the substantive issues.

TOPICALITY: It is a voting issue. I think most debates which focus on standards of topicality are boring. I prefer the "better definition" standard, with the better definition being the one which allows adequate argumentative ground for each team without destroying common sense meanings of words. In the 1986-87 topic, I believe that the restrictions being curtailed or prohibited must have been established in 1 or more federal court decisions.

COUNTERPLANS: Topical or non-competitive counterplans drop out of the round. Counterplans, like all other arguments, are not conditional.

COUNTERWARRANTS: Since I think the plan, as an example of the resolution, is the focus of the debate, I do not like counterwarrants.

OTHER CONCERNS: (1) Far too many debaters merely read massive amounts of evidence without providing any analysis as to why their arguments and evidence are superior to their opponent's arguments and evidence. Especially on this year's topic, debaters must take some time to critically evaluate evidence. I normally do not read much evidence after a round. (2) I do not sever plan planks. The entire plan presented in 1AC must be defended. (3) If you violate ethical standards, you will lose with zero points. (4) I dislike "tag team" cross examination. (5) I dislike "number next" systems of organization. Take the time to number your arguments. (6) Since I think the 1AC serves as a directional guide for the issues to be developed in the debate, I prefer a 1AC which is more than just three claims followed by 60 cards. I also don't think the 1AC should sound like a 1AR. (7) The last 2 rebuttals are the time when teams should select issues critical to the decision. In-depth coverage of selected issues is superior to superficial coverage of all issues. Make some choices and provide your ultimate extensions in the last 2 speeches. (8) I strongly prefer disads which are specifically linked to the 1st Amendment freedom(s) being enhanced by the Affirmative plan.

Glenn Graham
Two years coaching
Nine tournaments judged

In my opinion it is impossible for any judge to evaluate a debate round without their own knowledge of the topic, opinions, and biases influencing the decision in some manner. If a wholly objective yardstick existed against which rounds could be evaluated then debates could either be judged by computers or decided among the debaters themselves with little dispute. This, obviously, is not the case. one can strive for total objectivity, but it cannot be achieved.

The actual words spoken in the round and the evidence read is far from the total process. Much more than this take place in the debaters' and judge's minds. One five- to ten-word tag line triggers numerous thoughts and connections in each of our minds. Because of this and because of the previous knowledge and preconceived beliefs with which I as a judge enter the round a simple tag line may be more or less to me than anyone else in the round. Suffice it to say, it will mean something different to all of us.

Because thse thoughts and connections discussed above are automatic and impossible to prevent it is necessary to discuss the manner in which I evaluate rounds and certain biases I may have on particular arguments or issues. The weaker the argumentation on both sides of an issue the more prevalent my biases probably are. Strong versus weak argumentation is always sufficient to overcome any biases. The three most relevant areas of concern are theoretical issues, evidence comparison, and risk calculus.

THEORETICAL ISSUES: I usually have no problems with conditional argumentation. As the number of counterplansincreases so does the credibility of affirmative arguments against conditionality. Counterplans that force the affirmative to contradict themselves also tends to lend more credence to affirmative attacks. I think it is very difficult to win punishment as an impact to conditionality bad or under any circumstance for that matter. If the affirmative wins conditionality bad I will evaluate the counterplans unconditionally.

I tend to believe that net benefits is th only real standard of competition for counterplans. Mutually exclusivity is only a subset of this. Agent of action counterplans (socialism, anarchy, etc.) do not seem to be very competative. Most of the aguments and the evidence the negative reads to support competition assumes gradualism and not simultaneous adoption of the plan and counterplan together. Affirmatives are generally unable to fully conceptualize this position.

Permutations are only a test of competition that have to retain some topical core. Most arguments against permutations deny the affirmative any ground on competion. Affirmatives often don't point this out.

As long as one is assuming a non-hypothesis-testing perspective topical counterplans are legitimate. Very rarely have I heard a well reasoned attack against this perspective in an actual round.

There are a few theoretical arguments that usually are easily defeated: justification, counter-warrants, and reverse voting issues.

EVIDENCE COMPARISON: The number of cards read on an argument does not impress me. It is the quality of evidence that sways me more. A long well reasoned card usually stands the challenge of many short unexplained pieces of evidence. Debaters should attempt to compare the quality of evidence in the round if they don't want me to do it myself. "our cards are tons better" means nothing. You should explain why your cards are better. Without any assistance from the debaters I usually first attempt to construct a world that can accomodate the con-

flicting evidence. If that fails I don't believe i Have any set manner in which I compare evidence.

One thing I should mention here is the notion of story-telling. Generally, if you can tell a better story your cards don't have to be quite as good. I will tend to do more work for someone who has made a genuine effort in piecing the round together. One caveat: you could be hurting in a major way if there is a wide disparity between your story and your cards. If story-telling had no influence on the decision judges would end up being mere evideence processors.

RISK CALCULUS: I tend to work from the impacts backward. The larger the impact the less link needed to win the argument. This does not mean that a large impact is the substitute for a link, only that I will tend to be more cautious in making my decision. This topic has lent itself to more successful link and uniqueness debating by affirmatives. The nature of this resolution has allowed affirmatives to more easily discredit the unique relationship between their plan and the link evidence the negative is reading.

N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: Cecilia J. Graves **INSTITUTION:** James Madison University

POSITION: Debate Coach **YEARS OF COACHING:** 4

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 8 (not counting Districts)

1. DECISION MAKING PARADIGM - I work primarily from a policy-making paradigm with occasional lapses into stock issues when the debaters take that focus in the round. Since debaters rarely request a particular paradigm for a round, I must rely on my own. Given the general abuses and distortions of debate theory in most rounds, I rarely accept the "punishment paradigm." If there seems to be a flagrant violation of "debate norms" and the debaters introduce the punishment paradigm, I will consider it in the round.

2. TOPICALITY - I consider topicality and extra-topicality to be voting issues. Within that framework, I allow the affirmative to define the terms for their example of the resolution. I accept the reasonability standard and place the burden on the negative to explain why the affirmative is unreasonable. I tend to view contextuality as the best way to determine the better definition.

3. COUNTERPLANS - I do not accept conditional or topical counterplans. If a negative team decides to counterplan, then that becomes the policy position they are defending for the round. I expect the counterplan to be nontopical, mutually exclusive, and to accrue net benefits beyond the affirmative advantage (archaic, I know). Recognizing that that does not always happen, I accept the permutation theory if it is applied and argued correctly. I expect the affirmative to explain the permutation they are defending in the first speech following the counterplan, and the two policies I then compare for the round are the permutation and the counterplan. I do not view the permutation as a third alternative. I reject counterwarrants on any topic, not just this one.

4. ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO - If the add-ons and turnarounds are legitimate and logical extensions of arguments then I consider them as I would any other argument in the round. Being more of a policy-maker, I don't allow major shifts or "discos". I expect both teams to identify their policy position and defend it throughout the round.

5. STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES - I do not mind a fast debate but I do expect the speakers to be coherent. If a speaker is incomprehensible then I can't flow the argument and it isn't in the round. I don't like tag-team debating, expecially during cross-examination, and tend to penalize the speaker points when it occurs. I prefer full cites, but recognize that as a fantasy rather than a reality. However I do expect a team to be able to provide a complete cite if they are asked. I consider that part of their evidentiary responsibility. I do not consider USA TODAY in '86 a complete cite. I generally don't like "political movement/consciousness disadvantages." I don't give them a great deal of weight unless the debaters reduce the round to only those issues. I find them difficult to believe, I think the political theory is pushed beyond its logical limits, and I think they, in general, sound ridiculous (I must be from District VII). I don't like excessive use of jargon, but I recognize some as a natural result of looking for word economy. I do NOT like profanity during the round and will penalize speaker points if the speakers seem to use it as if it were just part of the jargon. A final note, do not panic if I do not seem to be flowing every word in rebuttals. When the arguments are repetitions rather than extensions, I usually mark them as such and then listen. I am listening and I do know where you are on the flow. It merely means you are repeating rather than extending an argument, not that you have lost it.

JAMES GREENWOOD, Emory University
Four years debating, Rookie Coach. 7 tournaments attended this year.

Debate Paradigm: I view academic debate as a structured, competitive, and strategic game. I recognize that I enter the debate round with subjective views and opinions and try to minimize their impact on my decision making process; however, I do not claim to be a "blank slate." I do not believe the resolution is a hypothesis to be tested, nor do I believe that I am a policy maker. The goals of debate should not be limited to winning, but should include education and enjoyment. This judging philosophy is one of personal beliefs not a list of rules that should be forced upon the debaters, which I believe is counter to free expression embraced in debate.

Topicality: I do believe the affirmative plan should fall within the resolution. I probably am affirmatively biased, believing that the speaker should have the right to define what they mean. Standards, definitions, and voting criteria should be advanced in the debate. Analysis and explaination of the inter-relatedness of these arguments are crucial for winning topicality arguments. The topic is a guide to allow intelligent discussion and once a plan is deemed acceptable the debate should focus on the specific plan and its impacts.

Counterplans: I enjoy counterplans that demonstrate true alternative approaches to the affirmative problem area. This makes topicality or non-topicality of the counterplan unimportant. Competitiveness is the key. Truely competitve alternatives seem to be best demonstrated by a net benefit standard. The counterplan seems to be more than "just another argument"--it is a policy position. This belief makes me lean towards believing that conditionality is inappropriate; however, absent intentional abuse conditionality is understandable. I do not believe in negative fiat. Left to my own, I view permutations as a test of competition, but debaters can argue permutations as they wish.

Add-ons/Turnarounds/Discos: These are fun and legitimate strategies. They need to be explained. Care should be excercised in having contradictory positions and in deciding to use these options too late in the debate.

Style: I do not enjoy tag line debate. Clear, reasoned arguments are ultimately more persuasive. Speed is an element of victory but it does not replace thinking. Pointing out contradictions, evaluating arguments, clash, and concessions are powerful persuasive tools that should also be utilized. Please excercise intellectual integrity. This means a debater should think twice before advocating policies that are morally reprehensible. The debater can make these arguments but should be warned that my personal bias may interfere with how I, interpret such arguments. Ethical challenges are not to be taken as another strategic option. The challenger will pay the piper for unsubstantiated claims. This activity should be fun and educational. As my friend and ex-coach, Steve Dolley says, "The best debaters, like the best people in all walks of life, are courteous and considerate to their colleagues, opponents, and judges. Rudeness and ad hominems never help, and often hurt, your persuasiveness." I promise to be fair and devote my full concentration, ability, and work effort into making the best decision I can make.

Jim Greenwood

NAME: (Bro.)Edward Grinder, O.S.B. **INSTITUTION:** Saint Vincent College

POSITION: Director of Debate **YEARS OF COACHING:** 6

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 6

Probably the best way to describe my judging philosophy is as critic of argument. I really prefer to allow the debaters to establish the paradigm from which they choose to argue. The only requirement is that they let me know where they are and that they be consistent to a stated paradigm or position. Frequently, debaters switch paradigms within a round leaving me with the impression that they are on a fishing trip. That really doesn't work well with me. Further, I find that debaters are more frequently than not asking me to intervene in the debate, either explicitly or implicitly by leaving arguments unstated or unexplained. I have a strong bias against judge intervention into the round. It is my committed position that when I am forced to intervene or reconstruct a round, it means that the points were not argued but strewn about. I believe that this is bad debate. I would really rather pass judgement on what is argued in the round by the debaters.

With respect to the standards for topicality, I really believe that it is up to the teams to argue the standards that I should accept. I have accepted a very wide variety and almost exclusively on the terms established in the round by the debaters. I find that most of the disadvantages are largely specious, however, I cannot remember a disadvantage that hasn't won a round. By the way, I still believe that case is of value.

On the issue of topicality, I have found no particular term of any greater importance. Extratopicality is an issue that impacts on the significance of a claimed advantage especially when weighed against the disadvantages presented in the round.

The question on counterplans is interesting in that I do not believe that this is a topic that lends itself readily to this strategy. I would prefer that they be mutually exclusive in that I have found this to be the one that leads to the most clash in the round. However, I will accept any standard presented that is real (non-artificial) and reasonable. I do believe that the negative must clearly win competitiveness. I really do not accept the notion of topical counterplans because I do not believe the theory to be true and that they violate competitiveness. I would like to be shown but I have yet to see it. It is my position that counterplans as a strategy has been abused and misused. I accept conditional counterplans especially when they are being use to lock the affirmative into a position. I have no particular problem with them but do believe that they must be consistent with the negative position.

I personally find the use of add-ons and turnarounds to be very acceptable. The greatest problem is that most people claim turns but never explain the turn. This is frequently an area where I am forced to intervene and from above you will note that I do not consider that the sign of good debate. I am not a fan of disco and consider position shift, which is what some people call disco, in the 2AR a voting issue against the perpetrator.

With respect to the question of style, I am a traditionalist. It is my opinion that there is too much emphasis on technique and theory and the art and communication are frequently lost. I have no problem with speed and do not read evidence. My reasons on the latter are the following. I have found that my hearing and comprehension of evidence is good. I seldom misunderstand a piece of evidence. Evidence reading is usually the result of blither. I have a simple approach to the handling of blither-I ignore it. If that costs the round to a team, so be it. In cross-examination, I demand that it be pointed and civil.

FRANK GULIUZZA
Director of Forensics--University of Notre Dame
First Year
Seven Tournaments [Prior to District V Tournament]

Let me preface everything by indicating that I've always felt that I should judge the debate by allowing debaters as much freedom as possible. Hence, I have voted for debaters who were faster than I have liked, ran silly competitiveness observations, "proven" that topicality is not a voting issue, or won a DA that I don't believe [e.g. the impacts to the New Right disad]. However, I realize that I probably don't judge without biases and quirks so I hope that this philosophy form proves helpful.

I prefer to judge the debate as a ***policy maker*** playing the role of the President, a member of the legislature, or, on this topic, a Supreme Court justice determining whether or not to overturn previous decisions. I am open to other paradigms as they are debated in the round. Minimally, the affirmative must present a case and plan that are *prima facie*. I expect them to be topical, to overcome an inherent barrier, and offer some significant advantage. I am not pleased when the affirmative allows their advantage to be whittled down to "just enough to carry a comparative advantage." The aff did not deliver anything close to what they promised in 1AC and, therefore, I give the negative some presumption with regard to risk on DA's and solvency presses wondering what would be left of aff significance if there were just one more speech. I, like most I suspect, am not overwhlemed by this year's stock disads but, as I mentioned, I still vote for them when I believe the negative has successfully defended them. I clearly think ***topicality*** is a voting issue but that the negative must win the issue convincingly. I give the aff room to be reasonsable and don't like silly neg topicality arguments. But I have voted neg on topicality many times this year when this issue is argued well. It seems the rounds I have judged that the First Amendment [v. the 14th Amendment], curtail/prohibit, and established in violations have been the most important and most persuasive. I think ***counterplans*** are a legitimate tool by the negative, but it does seem that generic counterplans might not be as necessary this year as in other seasons when the variety of affirmative cases was greater. While I might like to see counterplans defended straight up, and as alternative policies, conditional counterplans are acceptable. I might like to see negatives indicate, from the outset, just what the counterplans are conditioned on [save that "when we lose it, then it was conditional"]. I am really not sure how I feel about permutation theory. I guess it is a legitimate tool to employ against generic conditional counterplans. I have not heard counterwarrants presented by the neg on this topic, so I don't know how I would feel about them. Of course, ***add-ons*** and ***turnarounds*** are always legitimate affirmative strategies. An aff can win my ballot by carrying an additional advantage or by turning a disad. Usually, smart negatives will use other aff arguments to de-fuse those disads they are losing and, thus, it makes it difficult for the aff to win on turns.

My biggest concern is with ***style and other issues***. I really like fast debating, but I don't understand why judges are so acquiescent to *check sheet* debating [especially those judges who I used to debate for and who never would have tolerated some of this stuff]. I am distinguishing check sheet debate from fast debate. The former seems to operate under the assumption that all arguments are equal and all evidence is equal. Bad evidence and silly arguments are rewarded just as much as well evidenced and presented arguments. Hence, I am told to vote for a team because "we're outcarding them four to one." Further, check sheet debaters insist passionately in rebuttals that I go back and reconstruct [basically re-read] the round when it is over. I don't want to take an hour deciding the debate to which I just listened. I might as well ask for the aff and neg blocks and send both teams off for an hour until I've read them and made a decision. When debating for me, please keep the following in mind: I don't want to be made to feel responsible for costing a team the round because I didn't get [or understand] the turn in response #7--especially if I have tried. I won't call for evidence unless there is an ethical challenge or I feel it is my fault that I missed it. I will deduct points for lack of courtesy or when speakers are incomprehensible. When 1AC begins the blitzing then they had better be prepared to cover the negative counter-spread. My biggest caveat would be to make things clear. The debaters are placing too much in my hands when they spit out arguments without making them clear. I recall when we were coached to debate for one judge: "In the final rebuttal, just make sure you end by writing her ballot out for her--clarify the important winning issues," was the advice. That's probably not bad advice when debating for me.

PETER HAMMER
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
TOURNAMENTS JUDGED: 6

In my opinion what happens in a debate round should be left as much as possible to the debaters. This provides the debaters with a great degree of freedom, but it also imposes a high degree of responsibility. In practice this means that I will be listen to just about anything that is intellegently argued and defended. It also means that I will not reward arguments that are poorly made no matter how popular they are or how sympathetic I may be to them.

My openess to arguments goes both ways. I am willing to listen to the generics of this year in multiple-scenario, large-impact oriented debates. I am also sypmathetic to debaters who argue for and defend a much more restrictive paradigm where links and emperical considerations are important. In either case, I am not pursuaded by tags and conclusionary statements. There has to be intellegent explainations backing them up.

I will listen to topicality agruments but I have a strong Aff bias and do not vote on them unless the Aff makes a mistake or is abusive. In most debate rounds standards are much adieu about nothing.

I have no problems with counterplans. I believe that most competition can be reduced to mutual exclusivity and net benefits. I do not like mindless permutations. To be valid, they must be substantive, well-developed, and provide a reason to adopt the Resolution.

I believe that strategy plays an important role in a debate round. This means that turnarounds, conditionality and discos can be valid. In my book, the abuses that these strategies can lead to can be checked by imposing minimum standards upon argumentation. To win my ballot, the issues must be well developed. If debaters use these tools and it detracts from the quality of their argumentation, they will loose. I am not sympathetic to opponents who whine about these issues.

These same comments are relevent to style. I have no problem with speed so long as it does not become an obstacle to quality debate. I have no problems with tags so long as they do not become a substitute for analysis. I will read cards after the round if necessary, but I do so very critically. The evidence had better not be over claimed and it must be clear and supportive of your point. I view the cards that I read as representative of all the evidence you introduce, and of your credibility in general.

In the ideal debte round the participants weigh the issues and resolve the conflicts for me. If they give an honest and credible evaluation, then that will be the analysis on my ballot. If neither side does this then I will do it for myself. If this has to happen, I view the arguments as vehicles that are to be test driven. I will test them for internal consistency and their ability to explain the competing scenarios. After this, I will piece together what appears to be the most probable outcome and maximize benefits from a policy-maker's standpoint.

Scott Harris University of Louisville
Director of Debate 6 years of coaching
Number of tournaments judged at this year--12

1) Decision Making Paradigm-- I generally view myself as an argument critic. I believe the debaters most competent to determine the nature of the paradigm within the debate. I have no problem with negatives who defend multiple positions as long as those positions are not fundamentally inconsistent. Debaters need to tell me what to do with contradictory arguments. I do not like punishment arguments or reverse voters on topicality. I will vote for an analytically sound argument even if there is no evidence read to support it. I generally try to avoid intervention into the debate round. I recognize, however, that a minimum level of intervention is impossible to avoid. I am not a blank slate. Although everyone tells me differently, I like to think I have some minimum intelligence. Consequently, I will not consider something a voting issue merely because a debater says something is a voter. There must be good reasons for why it is a voting issue.
2) I have never heard as many stupid topicality arguments as on this topic. As the year has progressed I have found myself less inclined to vote on it. If the negative wins it, however, I will vote on it. I believe that in order to win topicality the negative must prove that the affirmative interpretation abuses the topic in some manner.
3) Counterplans. I am very susceptible to voting for a well developed counterplan. I will listen to good permutations. Time-frame is not a good permutation. One could always say adopt the plan and then the counterplan. There must be an advantage for voting for the permutation over voting for the counterplan absent the permutation. The fact that one can permute is irrelevant. The question is whether the combination of the plan and the counterplan is superior to the counterplan alone. I believe topical counterplans are legitimate if they go in the opposite direction of the affirmative. I believe that conditional counterplans should have to be kicked out to an argument. It maximizes strategic options if the affirmative can choose to stick a team with a counterplan and run nothing but disads just as if they were straight flipping a disad. While this is inconsistent with pure hypothesis testing I think it equalizes some of the burdens and maximizes strategic choice in the debate.
4) Add-Ons/Turnarounds/Disco- These are all legitimate strategies assuming they do not result in fundamentally new arguments in rebuttals and that any advantages the affirmative claims stem from topical action. Add-Ons cannot be run against disads which they have nothing to do with and labelled as turns. A turn must flip either the link or impact of the disad.
5) If I can't understand you than as far as I'm concerned you didn't say anything. If I can't flow your cards or analysis than I won't vote on them. I prefer analysis to pure brief reading. I believe that the greatest benefit of competitive debate is that it teaches people to think. It bothers me alot when I watch debates where nobody bothers to use their brains.

1987 N.D.T. JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

Bill Henderson
Director of Forensics
9

University of Northern Iowa
More years than you'd believe

1. I'm a hypotester. But don't get hyped up by that. If Concordia can make absolutely no adaptations and win, so can others. To me, hypotesting means that I'm deciding for or against the resolution. This does not reduce evidence obligations nor increase percentage of negative votes by me. Nor does it make me willing to accept silly positions in the name of "permutations," "risk analysis," or any other obscure cause. I will intervene in a round (just as does every person, however much they think reading cards reduce this). When? When I believe matters of ethics arise, when my level of belief about a matter is stretched beyond belief, and when the causal linkage for an advantage/disadvantage requires a more creative mind than ought to be in a debate round. (Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus, but one gift you'll not get from me is a ballot based upon the impact a single court case being overturned will have upon potential nuke holocaust)

2. The better definition will decide topicality for me. A combination of round evidence and argument determines which is the better definition. It is, of course, a threshhold and voting issue. Extratopicality? When topicality is decided, so is extratopicality. These matters usually go away when I decide whether or not a resolution is necessary to gain advantages, because things which can be done without the resolution don't influence whether or not to do the resolution. In other words, if you explain why certain benefits claimed by an affirmative are not consequences of resolutional action, then I'll disregard those matters when I determine whether or not to adopt the resolution.

3. A counterplan must a) be non-resolutional, b) competitive (not just artificially so), and c) not best adopted in conjunction with the resolution. Conditionality? Of course. What non-topicality standards? I guess if the affirmative must be determined by the best definition, then so would argument about the negative's counterplan. Affirmativeland includes more than one case, and so argument in one round about one affirmative plan being topical doesn't give the rest of the policy options to the negative. Counterwarrants are for Jack Rhodes, not me.

4. I am relatively liberal on add-ons/turnarounds, but less so for disco. Basically, I get confused. So if you try it, you'd better make it very clear, because I give your opponents a lot of latitude when there have been 873 arguments, and you go to 4 of them to decide the debate.

5. Please slow down. And don't think that because I don't write down every citation that I'm not attending what you're saying. Most of your comments are thoughtful, and I think about them. If you're incomprehensible to me, as a judge I'll punish you two ways; I'll deduct a lot of speaker points and vote against you.

Dale Herbeck
Director of Forensics
Boston College

1. PARADIGMS. Debaters are advocates, proposing competing policy systems and I am the decisionmaker who selects which policy is more advantageous. The affirmative should select what it thinks is the best topical example of the resolution, and the negative should select what it thinks is the best non-topical alternative to the affirmative. The debate involves the comparison of these two policies. Justification arguments, which merely question the topical alternative without committing the negative to an alternative policy, are not reasons to reject the affirmative plan. My choice is between two competing policy systems, not the affirmative policy against all others. Conditional argumentation is illegitimate (and hence a reason to vote against those who argue conditionally), as no sane advocate would simultaneously propose inconsistent positions.

2. TOPICALITY. The affirmative plan is nothing more than one example of the resolution. Hence, by definition, "counter-warrants" and hasty generalization arguments are flawed. The affirmative has the right to define terms, and need only advance a reasonable definition to prove the case is topical. To prove a case non-topical, the negative must prove that the affirmative's definitions are unreasonable. This invariably requires that they do more than assert one or two tag lines labeled topicality at some point in the debate. The more topical a case seems, the more latitude the affirmative has in answering topicality arguments. I find that I seldom vote against topical cases on topicality arguments.

3. COUNTERPLANS. Counterplans must be non-topical, competitive, and advantageous. Since the affirmative need only be reasonably topical, counterplans need only be reasonably non-topical. Before the counterplan becomes competitive with the plan the negative must demonstrate that it directly competes with the topical mandate of the affirmative plan. To do this they must identify and defend a standard of competition, prove that the counterplan is competitive by the standard, and then prove that the counterplan advantage flows from the competitive provisions of the counterplan. The affirmative may legitimately use "permutations" to prove that the counterplan is not competitive. Most counterplans are not competitive. If the negative counterplan is proven either topical or not competitive, the negative necessarily loses the debate as they are left without a policy alternative to defend. You are held accountable for all counterplans regardless of their length or detail of development. Utopian counterplans are fictions and thus not a realistic alternative to the affirmative plan.

4. ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO. The affirmative may legitimately claim additional advantages in second affirmative constructive. Turnarounds should flow from topical features of the plan, should respond either to the link or the impact of the disadvantage, and should be clearly labeled. "Disco" can salvage an occasional victory, but frequently lead to disaster.

5. RISK ANALYSIS. Although a useful construct in policy analysis it is generally misused in debate. The risk of some advantages or disadvantages is so insignificant that it does not constitute a real risk and therefore does not constitute a valid argument. Such low risk scenarios can be dismissed with one or two good link arguments.

6. STYLE AND MISCELLANEOUS CONCERNS. I read evidence as necessary to arrive at my decision. I never read evidence, nor do I consider arguments delivered at an incomprehensible rate of speech. Most debaters would be considerably better if they talked slower and made fewer stronger arguments. I am generally predisposed against generic arguments (especially counterplans). The more germane your arguments are to the case the more likely I am to vote for you and award respectable speaker points. While I still try to objectively consider all arguments, speaker points will be awarded based on the quality of your arguments. Mindless generic arguments deserve inferior points. I will also penalize debaters who are rude or obnoxious, as well as those who insist on answering questions directed to their partner. Falsification of evidence is an absolute voting issue, regardless of the intent or culpability of the speaker using the evidence. In other words, you are personally responsible for all of the evidence that you read.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Keith Herron
Samford University

Years Coaching: 1
Tournaments: 11
Rounds: 93

DECISION PARADIGM: I find myself to be more of a Policy-Maker than any other paradigm. The other paradigms really do not bother me but they appear to be more confusing and if you know me that creates a problem. I know that several of you consider me a "blank slate" but I try not using this arcane standard to evaluate a debate round.

TOPICALITY: I agree with Prof. Kauffman that topicality should be a voting issue. I feel that topicality is a rule of the game that should be enforced. I do not find myself voting on nuclear war outweighing topicality or topicality should be a reverse voter for the affirmative if they win it. However, debatability and other standards can help or hurt the affirmative. The affirmative should not feel I will always drop them on topicality because that simply is not true. I have not voted that much on topicality this year and the negative has to do a really good job on it for me to consider it. The affirmative has presumption on topicality. (I guess if you do vote on T then you do not have to look at the other issues which makes it a easy way out and more time for the FINAL FOUR basketball games.)

COUNTERPLANS: I like counterplans. Conditional counterplans are not a big problem with me if they can be defended. I do like developed counterplans and not ones that are created with speech time left in the 1NC. The net benefit standard is the one I use to determine competition and mutual exclusivity has a way of working itself back to net benefits. The other standards for competition are just deplorable, mindless, useless, thoughtless tag-lines. One could use one's time more productively sightseeing lovely Normal, Ill.

STYLE: I think it adds a lot to the debate. Speed is not the issue but comprehensibility is the key. Try to have some fun and relax and not show your real personality.

* Discos are fine with prior warning and punishment arguments should only be used against those starting the argument. Good luck to everyone and if you have any remaining questions about my judging philosophy you are not the only person and you should feel free to contact my adviser Prof. Chester Gibson. I do not find myself often voting for a team just because they are higher up on Brad Ziff's LIST but, after all, this is my last tournament and I am a hired judge.

E. HINCK, CSU FULLERTON, ASSIST. DEBATE COACH, 8 YEARS, 6 TOURNS.

DMP: CRITIC OF ARGUMENT. THEORETICAL ARGUMENTS SHOULD BE SUBSTANTIATED WITH EVIDENCE AND EXAMPLES DEMONSTRATING THE UTILITY OF A PARTICULAR APPROACH TO DEBATE THEORY. AT A MINIMUM, ARGUMENTS SHOULD CONTAIN A CLAIM AND SOME FORM OF SUPPORTING REASONING OR ANALYSIS. I REWARD CLARITY IN STYLE AND SUBSTANCE. I TRY NOT TO INTERVENE. WHEN THE ROUND IS MESSY I TRY TO DO EQUAL AMOUNTS OF INTERPRETIVE WORK FOR BOTH TEAMS. I PREFER THAT THE DEBATERS TAKE POSITIONS AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE IN THE DEBATE RATHER "POSTURING" OPTIONS, MAKE CLEAR CHOICES IN REBUTTALS, AND DEVELOP A CLEAR FOCUS FOR EVALUATING THE POSITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN DEVELOPING FROM CONSTRUCTIVES. T: AFF MUST WIN TOPICALITY; AFF IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DEFINING TERMS, NOT NEG. WHEN TERMS ARE NOT DEFINED, IF THE AFF INTERPRETATION OF THE RESOLUTION IS UNCLEAR THE NEG IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INQUIRING AT THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY AS TO THE AFF'S MEANING OF TERMS. FAILURE FOR AFF'S TO CLARIFY AT FIRST OPPORTUNITY (C-X OF 1AC IF 2NC ASKS) FORFEITS AFF'S RIGHT TO DEFINE TERMS. VALUE OF BLIPS ON T IS MINIMAL. I PREFER CLEAR TESTS OF INTERPRETATIONS TAKEN BY AFF'S AND NEG. STANDARDS SHOULD BE USED TO EVALUATE DEFINITIONS. STOCK ISSUES: AFF MUST WIN THEM. I VOTE ON INHERENCY IF THE AFF DOES NOT KNOW WHY THE STATUS QUO CANNOT SOLVE THE PROBLEM ABSENT THE RESOLUTION AND THE NEG CAN DEFEND A NONTOPICAL COMPETITIVE COMPONENT WITHIN THE STATUS QUO (MINOR REPAIR) OR OUTSIDE OF THE STATUS QUO (COUNTER-PLAN). CROSS-EX: FUNCTION IS TO CLARIFY. SHOULD WEAKNESSES BE DISCOVERED IN CROSS-EX THEY SHOULD BE USED IN CONSTRUCTIVE AND REBUTTAL SPEECHES TO SUPPORT ARGUMENTS. EVIDENCE STANDARS: DEBATERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT THEY READ. FABRICATING OR FALSIFYING ARE GROUNDS FOR LOSSES. CHALLENGING THE INTEGRITY OF A TEAM IS A SERIOUS CHARGE; THOSE WHO CHALLENGE SHOULD BE PREPARED TO PROVE THEIR CASE WITH ORIGINALS. AN ETHICS CHARGE SHOULD BE DISTINGUISHED FROM A DECISION-RULE. ETHICS CHARGES ARE NOT DEBATABLE, STAND APART FROM SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES BECAUSE THEY DISRUPT THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ACTIVITY, AND SHOULD BE MADE ONLY IN THE RAREST AND MOST APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES. COUNTERPLANS: SHOULD NOT BE TOPICAL, BE PROVEN COMPETITIVE, SOLVE THE AFF'S PROBLEMS, AND OFFER SOMETHING MORE THAN THE AFF. DEBATERS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE ADVOCATES: DURING CROSS-EX, THE EXAMINEE SHOULD ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE EXAMINER. THE EXAMINEE'S PARTNER SHOULD NOT ANSWER QUESTIONS. ONCE OR TWICE CAN BE FORGIVEN BUT PATTERNS OF IGNORANCE AFFECT SPEAKER POINTS. POSITIONS SHOULD NOT BE SHIFTING LATE IN THE DEBATE. STYLISTIC CONCERNS: BE CLEAR. FAILURE TO ARGUE CLEARLY, COMPLETELY, AND PERSUASIVELY PUTS ME IN THE POSITION OF INTERPRETING INCOMPLETE ARGUMENTS. I WOULD PREFER NOT TO BASE THE DECISION ON MY BIASES, ATTITUDES, AND VALUES BECAUSE THE ARGUMENTS WERE NOT CLEARLY DEVELOPED IN THE ROUND. MY PERSPECTIVE MAY NOT ALWAYS BE CONSISTENT WITH A DEBATER'S PERSPECTIVE IN TERMS OF WHERE TO START IN EVALUATING THE ISSUES. I TRY TO WRITE DOWN AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE BUT EXCESSIVE SPEED MAY SURPASS MY NOTE TAKING ABILITY. WHAT I CANNOT COMPREHEND DUE TO EXCESSIVE SPEED CANNOT BE INCLUDED IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. THIS ALSO MEANS THAT I CANNOT PREDICT MY DESIRE OR CURIOUSITY TO EXAMINE EVIDENCE (WHERE ITS ALLOWED).

David B. Hingstman Baylor University 10 tournaments/10 yrs coaching

I view debate as the clash of ideas in a public forum. Debate gives us a unique opportunity to juxtapose the theories and empirical work of individuals who may not have considered the work of others. Moreover, the competitive presentation of information permits a critic to improve his/her ability to make predictions about the effects of favoring one of a number of conflicting social claims. If a debater convinces me that a particular decision rule is necessary to understand and evaluate her/his arguments correctly and that rule does not impose an excessive cost in depth of argumentation in the round, I will adopt it. My experiences to this point have not persuaded me to adopt any particular perspective that is not subject to modification as a result of arguments made in the round. I appreciate arguments that have internal coherence, analytical rigor, and strong predictive power. The following implications of interest to debaters flow from these ruminations:

1) TOPICALITY-- I treat a well-developed topicality argument as I would any other issue in the round; its significance for the decision should be argued in the round. I do not feel that any single term in the resolution has any special importance in the absence of argument about it. Parameters are not officially binding, but if a debater gives me good reasons to believe they should be consulted for interpreting the meaning of the resolution, I will employ them for that purpose. I have no objection to new cases at NDT.

2) COUNTERPLANS-- I will accept them as I would any other argument in the round, and the standard to be applied in evaluating them will depend upon what theoretical positions are argued in the round. In the absence of any theoretical argument, I would apply policy-making standards of topicality and competitiveness. I interpret the majority position on this issue at this time to mean that if the counterplan is the exclusive indication of negative policy in the round, its topicality would mandate an affirmative ballot, and competitiveness can be based on such criteria as mutual exclusivity or net benefits. Debaters who argue counterplans would thus be well advised to argue theoretical positions in the round if they want me to apply some alternative standard.

3) DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM-- As noted above, it is subject to debate in the round. If no argument is made and a threshold question of accepting or rejecting a particular argument arises on the basis of paradigm choice. I would employ the policy-making paradigm for that specific purpose. I resolve contradictions in argument and evidence by assessing degrees of validity and attempting to find ways to rationalize contradictions based upon the arguments in the round.

4) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS-- I do not impose special requirements for these arguments unless such requirements are supported by theoretical positions in the round. I allow rebuttalists to grant certain arguments to jettison others, but if it occurs in 2AR, I am unlikely to accept it unless there is no reasonably conceivable response the negative could have made to undercut the shift.

5) STYLE-- No stylistic excesses will cause me to deny a ballot to a team who has won the issues in a round, although speaker points may be vulnerable in particularly troublesome instances. I appreciate persuasive style except when it is used to hide flaws in argument development. I will read as much evidence after the round as I need to understand the arguments made, although my assessment will be colored by the course of argument development in rebuttals. Evidence misuse penalties vary according to the seriousness of the distortion. I flow cross-ex in most rounds, although the significance of cross-ex answers should be given in speeches.

Jeffrey Dale Hobbs
University of Kansas

7 years of coaching
10 tournaments

Decision Making Paradigm - To be honest, I'm not sure what to call myself. (You can probably think of a few things to call me on your own.) Anyway, the narrative paradigm intriques me (narrative fidelity and narrative probability) and I think that, like a critic of argument, phenomena should be looked at from a variety of perspectives/terministic screens. I prefer to be seen as a reasonable person making an intelligent, informed choice between two competing positions (policies, values, etc.). I like to vote for what I perceive to be the most reasonable position. I know that reasonability is a subjective standard; but debate is supposed to be a rhetorical activity. For an "argument" to count in the debate, I must be able to understand it and have some reason to believe it is true (evidence, analysis, etc.). If an issue is not decided by the debaters at the end of the round, I have no choice but to decide it for them.

Topicality - Both the affirmative and negative team need to be reasonable when arguing topicality. The affirmative should feel free to go on the offensive. That is, explain why you present a reasonable interpretation of the topic independent of the negative's objections. I usually do not try to find a "better" or "best" definition if I have a "reasonable" one.

Counterplans - Whatever happened to direct clash with the affirmative case? A counterplan should not be topical. I'm persuaded by a variety of competitiveness standards, although, I do prefer for the negative to deal with the harms presented by the affirmative. Counterplans and other arguments can be started conditionally, but the "conditions" must be specified. Additionally, by the last negative rebuttal, the negative team must make all of the choices concerning what they want left in the round. Conditionality is no excuse for contradictory positions. Permutations should be well explained.

Add-Ons/Turnarounds - I have no bias against these strategies as long as you keep a consistent position in the debate. Turnarounds (etc.) which are antithetical to one's original position are contradictions in my opinion. 2AR should be careful not to present a substantially "new" position.

Style - I expect both teams to be comprehensible. Go slow enough that I can understand what you are saying, think about what you are saying, and write it down legibly. This takes more time than you think it does. I am not simply an information processor. Go slow. Persuade me. Debate is a communication activity. In cross-x you should be nice. Answer the opposing teams's questions. I look down on debaters who withhold information until later speeches, especially, when they are asked a specific question. I do not expect debaters to answer yes or no questions, unless, they are given a chance to explain their answers. Finally, save some time in your rebuttal speeches to summarize the debate and tell me why you are winning. I reward debaters who really try to adapt.

*Feel free to ask me anything you wish about my judging philosophy during the course of the tournament.

Jodee Nobbs
University of Kansas
2
20

As a judge, I am willing to listen to whatever arguments that you want to make. I do have preferences, but I will still vote for arguments that I do not like if I am not given a good reason to vote against them. My decison-making paradigm is probably a combination of policy making and stock issues. I do like topicality arguments if they are specific to the case and if the Negative is trying to win them. I think reasonability as a standard for topicality is enough, especially when the topicality arguments made by the Negative are generic ones. Topicality is a voting issue.
Since I am partially a stock issues type person, I will vote on arguments such as inherency, solvency, and significance.
In voting on these issues I will use the standards that you set up in the round. I am also more than willing to apply the standards that you set up to your own arguments, if the other side requests it.
I feel that cross-examination is a time for teams to get information. It is not a time for teams to hedge around answers. It is also a time to set up arguments. Cross-x is fairly binding. If you are going to ask questions, let the other side explain their answer. I do not like rudeness in cross-x or at any other time.
Evidence is an important part of any argument. Since it is important I think that the evidence used in a debate round should be of quality. As far as standards of evidence, it is up to you to tell me what is good or bad and why. If not I will accept the evidence as good.
If you are going to run counterplans on the Negative, they should have the same significance and solvency burdens as the Affirmative case. As far as standards of competitiveness, I like mutually exclusive, net benefits, and sometimes even philosophical. Permutations are okay to run but they need to be clear and reasonable.
Counter-warrants are okay to run too. They are not my favorite thing, but they can sometimes serve a purpose. I am willing to listen to arguments against counter-warrants in general by the Affirmative.
EXTRAS: In general, if you haven't noticed I am a fairly conservative judge. There are arguments that are made which I find repulsive. I will vote for them if the other side does not beat them but I won't be a happy person. If you want to make conditional arguments that is fine, as long as you give me a final stance to take. If you cannot decide for yourselves what position is best in the round then I will vote against you.
It is up to you to make sure that I understand the positions that you are taking in a round. Take a few seconds to explain your arguments. Speed is cool as long as it is comprehensible.

Tom Hollihan, Director of Forensics
University of Southern California

I view academic debate as an educational laboratory which enables students to gain valuable experience in creating and evaluating arguments. I think the laboratory experience is most useful when the arguments students debate resemble those considered by "real world" decision-makers. Debaters should gain knowledge of argumentation theory, and improve their research, critical thinking, and communication skills.

Yes, the rumors are true, I do now attempt to view debates from a "story-telling" perspective. What this means essentially, is that I want the debaters to make arguments that are consistent and fit together in a dramatistic view of the world. These stories should have fidelity (seem to "ring true" and hang together, in other words meet the requirements of a coherent story); and should be probable (seem credible given the world as you and I have individually and socially come to know and understand it). This also means that I am emphatically not a tabula rasa critic, and I will not suspend my beliefs and experiences in the evaluation of your arguments. I will make every effort, however, to listen to the stories that you tell me and to give them fair hearing. I will not impose my beliefs on a debate until the participants have offered me their stories and given me explanations as to why their stories are more compelling than are those told by their opponents.

I also believe that debaters should tell me their best stories, and that these stories should not have contradictory plot-lines. Thus counterplans are great, but there should be only one and it should be defended throughout the debate. This counterplan should not be conditional and must not contradict your disadvantages, etc. I believe that debaters should be held accountable for the arguments they introduce in the debate, and because I believe that consistency is an important test of the believability of your story, advocates should take positions in the constructives and develop them throughout the course of the round.

I view my role to be that of an educator, and if necessary I will interject myself into debates in order to preserve what I perceive to be the important educational objectives of the activity. Thus, arguments such as "topicality is not a voting issue" carry little weight with me, even if they are dropped in rebuttals.

I like nice friendly debates. I dislike rudeness, I dislike it when one partner answers the other's cross-ex questions, or talks during a speech, etc. I will make every attempt to keep up with you even if you travel at breakneck speed, but I seldom read evidence after the round. If I miss something I generally credit that to your having failed to communicate your argument to me. Incidently, it really bothers me when debaters simply declare "number next" rather than clearly tag and number their arguments.

John P. Jackson, Asst. Debate Coach, Macalester College, three years coaching, ten tournaments on the topic.

TOPICALITY: Topicality is always a voting issue. I am very strict on topicality. I think that the affirmative should be able to point to at least one specific court case which established a restriction on the First Amendment. I think that topicality ''standards'' are a waste of time, the debating on topicality should be done on the violations. Topicality should be initiated in the first negative. Topicality needs to be explained at a slower speed than other debate issues. I dislike topicality as a time suck. A bunch of one line topicality positions read at top rate in the second negative is a good reason to vote affirmative. I haven't voted on topicality as much this year because most cases seem to be topical this year.

COUNTERPLANS: I FLOW ONE COUNTERPLAN PER ROUND. If the negative insists on reading a second or third counterplan into the round I will simply put down my pen until they are finished. I am sure the affirmative could use the extra prep time. Conditions for conditional counterplans should be clear. If the counterplan is extended in the 2NR, it is no longer conditional. This means if the disads link to the counterplan better than they link to the plan, they become reasons to reject the counterplan. If the disads link to the counterplan and the plan, the disads become moot. In order for the counterplan to be conditional the negative must claim it as conditional in the first negative. If they do not, no amount of squirming in the second negative can make it so. If a non-conditional counterplan is topical or non-competitive, the negative team loses.

CHANGE-OF-GOVERNMENT COUNTERPLANS: I loathe these counterplans. I find most discussion of these counterplans to be utopian. To those of us who inhabit the world as it is, utopia is pleasant to discuss in a philosophy class, but seldom does such discussion aid in making policy. I also think that these counterplans are not germane to our topic. Those advocates who wish to discuss such issues should try to get to topic committee to write a topic that addresses the issue.

DISADVANTAGES: The best disadvantages are those that the courts use. When federal courts restrict the First Amendment, they generally have reasons why they are taking this action. I think that the Court's reasoning can usually be defended against the beliefs of the law students and professors that the affirmative is undoubtedly quoting.

EVIDENCE: I will not call for evidence after the round. If a specific card is important to the round, the debater should re-read the card. This is an oral activity. If I were to read the evidence myself, it could be mailed to me in St. Paul and I would save myself another ride on I-35.

A FINAL THOUGHT: I value my First Amendment rights. I think democracy, while far from perfect, is the best possible form of government. The tendency of advocates to shy away from defending individual rights is very disturbing. Most debaters this year sound as if they thought we should have supported Hitler against Great Britain. I don't want to trust good leaders with powers I wouldn't let bad leaders have.

NAME: Bill Jacobs INSTITUTION: University of Iowa
POSITION: NDT Coach YEARS OF COACHING: 2 in College, 3 in High School
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR: 7

1.) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM I would describe my judging paradigm as a cross between Hypothesis Testing and Policy Making leaning more toward Hypothesis Testing. By this I mean that I will look for the best policy in the round and vote for it. The best policy is the policy that has the most net benefit. This means that disadvantages will be weighed against the advantages of a policy and thus the net benefit established. This allows the negative to offer as many policies as they wish and not be bound to any one of those unless they choose to be. An argument, in my opinion, is a claim supported by evidence and containing a connecting warrant. Usually the warrant is assumed and implicit. Evidence in the above sense is broader than just a quotation and may include judicial notice of a fact. If, however, there is no quotation then even more emphasis is placed on the warrant in that argument. I view debate as an educational game. I believe that sportsmanship must be displayed by all participants. As such the use of vulgar and/or overly expressive emotional language is not to be condoned. Other than this and the obvious evidence rules against falsification, I believe that issues and how issues should be decided are open to debate in the round and I will change my paradigm to fit the round.

2.) TOPICALITY I think that if a team has had prior notice (a case that has been run consistently over a period of time) then topicality ceases to be an issue. Appeals to tradition have little impact with me since the purpose of topicality has been met. The disposition of extratopicality is left open to determination in the round as are the standards for the better definition.

3.) COUNTERPLANS I think that the burdens of a counterplan are non-topicality and competitiveness. Competitiveness is either mutually exclusivity or net benefits (less desirable simultaneous adoption). Once these burdens are met then the policy of the counterplan is treated like any other policy in the round and its cost/benefit ratio determined and compared with all the other policies in the round. I do not believe that counter-warrants are valid on this year's topic.

4.) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO I will listen to anything. I personally prefer that the affirmative be prima facia, but if it was not argued as being crucial then anything goes.

5.) STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES I despise the use of "number next". Make sure that any jargon or acronyms are understood by me before you abuse them. I will look at evidence if it is crucial to my decision, but I prefer to maintain debate as a speaking activity. Do not swear or use profane language. Enjoy the debate and do not turn the round into a battle to the death (be cordial). I will provide limited amounts of feedback and will interrupt your speech if I become lost. Road mapping is demanded and will not be taken off of your speech or prep time.

Judging Philosophy: Erik Jaffe, Dartmouth College
coached for 1 year and judged at 10 tournaments.

The easiest way to characterize my judging philosophy is that I'll listen to virtually anything, but I'm more likely to vote for a team making a few intelligent, well-applied arguments (particularly when narrowing in rebuttals) as opposed to a team making a plethora of largely irrelevant blips that may contain one or two good answers. This isn't to say that I dislike hearing many arguments in constructives, just that I'd rather not hear 20 responses on "permutations bad" when most of them are redundant or don't apply to the situation at hand.

In general paradigmatic terms I consider myself a games player. Whatever set of rules the debaters prefer to debate under I will judge by. In a debate between two sets of rules I will decide based upon arguments concerning fairness, debatability, and any other novel reasons the debaters may offer for prefering one set of rules over the other. The only absolute rules I will enforce are time limits and truthfullness of evidence. Falsified cards result in a loss and zero points. Since I am so draconian in this respect, false accusations of fabrication are treated in the same manner. The team making the evidence challenge better have some form of original as proof and better be sure that it's actually an instance of falsification as opposed to a different, though plausible, interpretation of a given statement. With regard to specific types of arguments I have a number of predispositions, none of which are particularly strong as applied to my judging:

Counterplans: I think net benefits and mutual exclusivity are the primary forms of competetiveness. All other supposed competetiveness standards tend to be rephrasings of these two. I think extracompetetiveness arguments are silly. I think permutations are the only real way to test mutual exclusivity. When making permutations I think specific examples are needed (as with intrinsicness and justification arguments). I tend to view conditionality as fine though I will listen to a well articulated position against it.

Topicality: Debates on standards these days frequently degenerate into a series of mindless blips that never get applied to specific violations or definitions. I would much rather see the standards debate incorporated into the structure of the violation itself and answered there. One thing I hate is when a team runs six T violations, four of which clearly have nothing to do with the aff. I start off with the presumption that T is a voter, though that can change based on the arguments in the round.

Disads: I'll listen to most anything, though if the links are ridiculously miniscule and contorted I will be very sympathetic to aff presses, and not very persuaded by mindless whines about RISK and BRINK.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AT AMHERST

Department of Communication Studies

Machmer Hall
Amherst, MA 01003
(413) 545-1311

Shelly R. James

Assistant Debate Coach Fourth Year

Number of Tournaments Judged at this Year -- 5

Paradigm -- I am probably a "policy maker" which means that I weigh the disadvantages and the case advantage against each other, or the plan and counterplan against each other. I don't like punishment issue arguments and have never voted on one. Because I do a lot of weighing at the end of the round, it is important for the debaters to make their positions clear in rebuttals. Debaters should be making comparisons of the major arguments in the round and explaining why they win the round, not just doing line-by-line "analysis" (1AR is given a little leeway). You can read decision rule cards and I will use them in my evaluation of the round, but unless they have some analysis, or are dropped, it is usually fairly easy for the other team to make the decision rule a little more "realistic."

Topicality -- I hate standards debates, especially when the teams debate about whether "limits" is a good standard or not, and then never bothers to apply this to any definitions in the round. I personally don't see how a person can absolutely decide which definition limits more, since all definitions include and exclude something. Rarely will one definition be an absolute subset of another. As a result, I rarely use this standard. While I am critical of the way standards are debated today, I really like a good topicallity debate (not bogus violations, and more emphasis on the plan and definitions than on which standard is best). I am hard on standards, but if the plan is not topical, the Negative can win on that alone. I don't think I've ever been convinced that Topicality is not a voting issue.

Counterplans -- I tend to agree that all competition standards come down to net benefits, but I also think that a plan and counterplan can compete in more than one way under the net benefits standard. I don't like "philosophical" or "redundant" standards. I believe permutations are a legitimate test of competition. I also think counterplans should be non-topical.

Add-Ons are fine, though it seems easier on the Affirmative if they present the beginnings of any bigger impacts in 1AC. Turn-arounds can win the round for the affirmative, if they really are turns. If all the Aff. has left is one turn that isn't really a turn, it is most likely that the topic will be rejected. I don't like sleazy debate, but I do like clever debate (it seems to be a matter of how well you set up the argument and how strongly it is defended).

Style -- I don't mind speed, as long as it doesn't consist of all tag lines. I want to hear analysis and I reward it with speaker points. I will look at evidence at the end of a round when the tournament rules have allowed it, though I tend to look at a lot less evidence than most other judges. I do listen very closely to the evidence when it's delivered and if the evidence is bad, you don't have must hope of winning the argument.

The University of Massachusetts is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

Dale Jefferson — 5 years coaching

Houston Baptist University — 5 tournaments

Judging Philosophy

1. Topicality - Absent a significant affirmative blunder, I rarely vote on topicality. I give the aff much leeway on topicality and feel debates on topicality standards are a waste.

2. Decision making - I finish taking the Texas Bar Exam at 12:30 on Friday and Round I of District starts at 2:00 so I would assume that I'll be in a "reality check" paradigm. Hopefully I'll recover before NDT. Given my background, however, I tend to be a little "real-world" on this year's topic. Tangible DA links and true mutual exclusivety on counterplans are general standards that highlight my philosophy.

   As allowed in the legal world, conditional arguments are fine with me as long as a cohesive policy finally emerges. Indeed, as Emerson one said, "Foolish inconsistency is the hobgoblin of simple minds."

3. Style - Speed is fine but I'm a lazy judge who hates to reconstruct the round. I'm not impressed with "read the card after the round," hunt for my excellence, "that argument is above," or the Hollywood approach, "that argument is a coming attraction below." Overall my general viewpoint is that "I'm on board so lets pull up the ladder," in other words, if you lose its your fault.

4. Others - CX is not a tag team event. Start your round on time. The lower the case sig the more I buy linear risk DA's. I will vote on turnarounds as long as it is more than a tag line. I give the affirmative significant leeway on 5 card "Balloon disads." New links and/or impacts in 2NC can justify creative explanations and extrapolations in 2AR. Counterwarants/World Government CP (basically the same thing) are presumptively worthless on most cases but some cases beg for it so I'll listen and maybe even flow. Good Round, Good Luck, Good Bye.

NAME: James A. Johnson INSTITUTION: The Colorado College

POSITION: Director of Forensics YEARS OF COACHING: 31 years

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR: Ten prior to District Qual.

1) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM. I am primarily, but not exclusively, a policy maker. The affirmative should give me a significant reason why the policy should be adopted and should present a reasonable method of achieving that policy. The advantage presented by the affirmative must outweigh any disadvantages presented by the negative. Yes, I still believe inherency is a voting issue if properly presented and defended. I should not and will not debate for the debaters, but the debaters should expect I have reasonable experience and knowledge in the area of debate. I know that topicality is a voting issue. Debaters should expect that experienced judges have a knowledge of debate theory. I will not vote on a "punishment paradigm". Debaters must decide whether an argument is a "time suck" and spend time according. I have difficulty believing a minor change in the status quo will result in nuclear holocaust and, thus, am pleased when the affirmative attacks links to disadvantages and will not accept a DA that the affirmative proves is not linked.

2) TOPICALITY. Topicality is absolute. I will vote to reject the affirmative case regardless of other arguments if the negative proves the affirmative is not topical. However, I expect a higher standard of proof than I do for other arguments. I am willing to throw out extra-topical planks and vote for what is left of the affirmative advantage.

3) COUNTERPLANS. The counter plan must essentially solve the affirmative need area, must be non-topical, and must be competitive. If I can adopt both, I will vote affirmative. I do not object to conditional counterplans, but believe affirmative is wise to learn early what the conditionality rests on.

4) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS. The affirmative must be prima facia in first affirmative constructive, but add-on advantages may be valuable in offsetting disadvantages. For me, turnarounds offset the disadvantage. If the affirmative turns the DA, it is gone from the round, but I don't give the affirmative any added significance. Clear need for a change must be demonstrated in first affirmative constructive. I don't think a team that "discos" is particularly effective, but I don't add any punishment.

5) STYLE. I expect debaters to be clear. I will not give credit for arguments that are presented in an incomprehensible manner. Speed does not bother me, but failure to communicate does. If I quit flowing, debaters might consider trying to speak more clearly. I do not read evidence after the round except in the case of challenge. Debaters might consider re-reading a piece of evidence if it is vital to the round rather than suggesting I look at it after the round. I like good organization, but try to flow arguments even when all subpoints are labeled as subpoint next. I enjoy good analysis and good reasoning in a round.

N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: Kamberleigh Johnston INSTITUTION: George Mason University

POSITION: Debate Assistant YEARS OF COACHING: 1

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 8+

I would say I'm basically a policy maker. The major implications of this philosophy is that I loath inconsistent/contradictory arguments. I often need a DA to vote negative but a number of times this year Affs have allowed negatives to establish standards which they failed to meet, thus I voted negative without a DA. If you go the PNM route, make sure they are virtually absolute. I allow the debaters to determine what is the minimum standards of argument. If negative honors a non-prima-facie case--they just might lose. As long as a punishment paradigm is well argued and more than a one line blip, I will probably honor it assuming the other team does not flip your standard on you. I will intervene and weigh arguments when 2NR/2AR fail to do so. Simply saying the DA outweighs is not sufficient, I want to know time frame, probability etc. with a reason to believe your projections are correct. For those teams that drop case and just go for the DAs--that may be a mistake. I give affirmative a lot of cross application room as long as they do it in a timely fashion. 2AR better rely on 1AR answers.

I hate the way topicality has been argued this year--the standards are advanced but poorly explained and often times the issue is just a time suck. If you want to run restrict doesn't mean to regulate, you better be crystal clear. I encourage affirmative standards, but again apply them. If affirmative can prove negative is being abusive on topicality (usually this isn't difficult), I will consider topicality as a reverse voter. If affirmative doesn't handle the issue, it is still a voting issue. A few cases, which I haven't heard, [redacted] sound a little non-topical, (Sleeping in the Park) for example. I thought speech was oral--do they talk in their sleep? Extra-Topicality if argued well can easily be a voting issue.

I strongly prefer mutual exclusivity, but if the negative can defend net benefits, then I will consider it. I wouldn't suggest philosophical competitiveness or its equivalent as your main competitiveness standard. Conditional counterplans are okay as long as the negative is explicit on what they are conditioned on. Multiple counterplans are not recommended as noted with a need for consistency.

Fine with me, but add-ons and turns better not be dependent on 1AC solvency--if the affirmative punts case. Disco is fine as long as I can keep up and you keep it consistent.

I might read evidence but if I cannot understand a person due to their speaking style, that great DA may not win the round. Politeness is strongly encouraged.

John Katsulas
Boston College

I'll be brutally honest: If you don't research topic relevant arguments, you should strike me. At this point in the debate season, I expect first negatives to argue case, and second negatives to run policy disadvantages linked to affirmative plans. You will not win my ballot by arguing esoteric debate theory or by running multiple, noncompetitive counterplans. I've given you fair warning. Adapt to my philosophy or strike me.

1. Paradigms: I'm not flexible. You must advocate a consistent policy position. At the conclusion of the debate, I vote for the team who has presented me with the more desirable policy option. The function of the resolution is to divide argumentative ground. It does not constitute the focal point of clash in the debate. Theories which presuppose a resolutional focus perspective (e.g., intrinsicness responses, justification arguments, counter-warrants, hypothesis-testing, hasty generalization, counter-resolutional counterplans, etc.) are illegitimate. Under no circumstance is it permissible for debaters to engage in conditional argumentation. I perceive such advocacy to be educationally deleterious; therefore, I disregard (which means that I don't flow them) all conditional arguments. Policy debate, if it is to be rationally conducted, requires that the advocates specify an agent of adoption. When asked in cross-examination, the first affirmative must explain how his/her policy is assumed to be adopted. The same burden is placed on the negative who advocates a counterplan. Fiat is limited to policy assumptions which are within the jurisdictional abilities of real world governmental actors.

2. Topicality: I reject using the 'better' definition standard of topicality. Such comparative standards encourage debaters to run banal lists of topicality arguments (e.g., establish means to create). The reasonability standard sufficiently limits the topic. To win topicality, the negative must prove that the affirmative's definitions are unreasonable. This may be done by demonstrating that the affirmative's definitions violate the field or grammatical context of the resolution. Topicality is an absolute voting issue. Topicality is never a reverse voting issue. The affirmative may specify plan funding and insert plan spikes to preclude disadvantages. The negative may link disadvantages to such provisions. In the event that a portion of the affirmative plan is proven to be extra-topical, the affirmative may still win by defending other topical plan action. Disadvantages which are linked to nontopical plan planks remain as negative voting issues. If the affirmative plan is really not topical, the negative should not hesitate to argue topicality in front of me. However, you will have a difficult time (some say impossible) persuading me to vote on a pseudo-topicality violation against a topical case.

3. Counterplans: Counterplans must be nontopical and competitive. I will apply stringent competitiveness standards to all counterplans. Mutual exclusivity and net benefits are the only two standards for demonstrating competitiveness. Counterplans which ban the affirmative plan in order to be mutually exclusive and then claim advantages which in no way compete with the affirmative plan are not competitive. By all means, permute away awful counterplans. If the negative team loses the nontopicality or competitiveness of its counterplan, they automatically lose the debate, for they have no policy left to defend in the debate round. Utopian counterplans are intellectually bankrupt. It is incomprehensible to me how one could possibly represent anarchy, socialism, world government, or authoritarianism as realistic policy choices. Don't even contemplate running such an abomination in front of me. Needless to say, conditional counterplans are unacceptable.

4. Evidence: Falsification or distortion of evidence is an absolute voting issue. False or unsubstantiated charges are as heinous a crime. Complete source citations do not have to be read in the debate but must be available upon request. I will read evidence at the conclusion of a debate. Banning evidence reading is irrational, since many judges feel that it helps them to make better decisions.

5. Other issues: A debate round is not the appropriate forum for discussing rule changes relating to time limits, the number of speeches, etc. Cross-examination answers are binding. Tag-team cross-ex is unacceptable. If your partner is too dumb to answer questions, you should look for a new partner. Speak as fast as you can intelligibly read evidence and make arguments. I will disregard incomprehensible arguments and evidence. Rude and obnoxious debaters will receive lower speaker points. Intelligent presses are sufficient to dismiss linkless disadvantages and advantages. At some point, the probability for some disadvantages and advantages becomes so low as to be negligible. For example, you will have trouble convincing me that an affirmative plan precludes the onset of socialism in the United States. When negative, my advice to you is to run disadvantages which are specifically linked to affirmative plans. I prefer that you make intelligent arguments, with or without evidence; I dislike it when you mindlessly read inapplicable blocks.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
THE SCHOOL OF SPEECH
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
1815 CHICAGO AVENUE

(312) 491-7530

Charles Kauffman
Director of Forensics, 8 years coaching, 10 tournaments this year

Decision making paradigm: Of course I intervene but I try to do so in a manner consistent with the development of arguments in the debate. I expect every argument to consist of a claim and a coherent rationale explaining the claim. Where no rationale is present, if I do not understand the claim, I am unlikely to vote for it. Generally, I expect teams to defend a consistent value position throughout the debate. I am not usually impressed by teams that decide sometime after the first affirmative that the best way to extend the first amendment is to destroy it.

Topicality: I hate to see this argument used as a time waster. I hate it so much that I usually give offenders lower points. If you decide to argue topicality, you should make sure your definitions exclude affirmative interpretations. Generally, if the affirmative finds a court case that somehow restricts the first amendment, they are likely to be topical and negative assertions to the contrary will bear a heavy burden of proof.

Counterplans: I think counterplans cannot be both topical and provide a reason to vote negative. The only meaningful competition standard is net benefits. Every other standard is subsumed in this one. I have always thought that counterplans which do directly what the affirmative achieves as a secondary effect of expanding free speech are a good idea. Thus, it makes more sense to me to build homes for the homeless, to ban SDI, etc., than it does to attempt to achieve these by expanding the first amendment.

Nouvelle debate: Tactics should not dominate substantive concerns. Teams may concede arguments, or reverse them on an unwitting opponent, but in so doing, they ought defend a coherent and consistent value position.

Style and other issues: I never call for evidence because I believe that to do so unacceptably intervenes in the debate process. If evidence is controversial, I expect debaters to debate the interpretations in the round. If evidence is read unintelligibly, it probably will not figure in my decision. Political movement CP/DAs are theoretically acceptable. The problem with them is that the evidence is terrible and hence teams attempt to avoid debating many of the issues that are most relevant (Competition, solvency, brink, threshold). Most of the evidence in support of these ideas is biased and untestable (there is no way to falsify the claim) and so, I give it little credence. Cross examination has been poorly used. Each debater should speak for her/himself. I enjoy hearing debates and I especially enjoy debates in which the debaters are thinking about the interaction of issues and evidence that they are having fun.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Jack Kay, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Director of Forensics, twelve years of coaching, judged at five tournaments this year.

1) DECISION MAKING PARADIGMS I have been through all the fads and phases of the activity--from the stock issues of mallum, pretium, sanibilitas, and remedium, to the quirks of the hypothesis-testing policy maker once removed. My preference is to be a critic judge who evaluates the language usage strategies of debaters engaged in substantive clash over issues related to the current intercollegiate debate topic. As such, I get excited when hearing two teams going at it over the issues that inhere in the resolution. I do believe that the best arguments on paradigm use stem from the nature and grammar of the resolution. Paradigm arguments based upon "that's what everybody else uses" strike me as "whining." By the way, I personally feel that this year's resolution legitimizes a judicial approach to discovering and evaluating issues. The judicial paradigm requires a decision-making structure quite different from policy-making. An sit, quid sit, quali sit, and translatio were the original stock issues for forensic discourse.

2) TOPICALITY My particular bias on what constitutes an existing restriction is fairly liberal. However, I do feel affirmatives should in some way deal wih the first amendment to the U.S. constitution.

3) COUNTERPLANS I enjoy the counterplan that is used because a team truly feels it is a better alternative to the resolution and the status quo. In a counterplan round both sides are advised to pay particular attention to organization. I dislike messy rounds. If the counterplan is conditional, please tell me what the conditions are. I have no preconceived notion as to whether a team can sever planks of their counterplan (or of their affirmative plan for that matter). Similarly, I have no preconceived notion as to the legitimacy of hypothetical counterplans, although I am most comfortable when debaters argue from an advocacy perspective--defending that which they advocate. Agent counterplans seem unwise this year since the resolution allows affirmative virtually unrestricted choice in selecting an agent or agents. I do find reasonable the permutation approach which suggests that the permutation is a test of competition.

4) ADD-ONS/TURN-AROUNDS/DISCO In theory, great. In practice, however, many debaters are guilty of misuse. I do believe turns must meet prima facie burdens and that it is up to the negative to point out when such burdens are not met. I would like to see more from 1AR's than the label "turn." I do find myself increasingly voting on the bais of turns. I find the new 2AR turn extremely difficult to accept, unless 2NR provides a new DA. I am particularly hard on new responses in 2AR and on cross-applications which are not utterly clear and expectable.

5) STYLE Go as fast as you like so long as you remain intelligible. Cross-ex answers are binding and I will only listen to the person doing the questioning or being questioned--not their partner. Answer questions honestly. I really appreciate conceptual 2NR's and 2AR's. I enjoy listening to debaters who appear to be enjoying the activity. There is no excuse for rudeness or foul language. Fabrication of evidence, if proven, results in an automatic loss and zero speaker points. A frivolous fabrication charge earns the same.

6) MY OBLIGATION AS JUDGE I will work hard to render a fair and sound decision. Debaters should weigh the arguments and issues in the round. Do not tell me to decide for myself whether a DA outweighs significance--instead, tell me why the DA beats significance. Don't tell me to jetison a counterplan if I don't like it--instead, convince me to like it or justify the jetison. Don't tell me to read evidence at the end of the round--instead, tell me what is wrong or right with the particular piece of evidence (you can even reread the evidence in your speech). If arguments are conditional, give me a clue as to what the conditions are. Unqualified evidence is no better than your own opinion and I will enter this factor into the decision if either team cares to make it an argument. I dislike the "whining" approach to debate. I abide by NDT rules regarding secrecy of decision at the NDT and Districts.

Randy Lake
Director of Debate, Troy

Years Coaching: 13
Tournaments this year: 8

1) **Decision-Making Paradigm:** I have no favorite. When settling theoretical issues, I place a premium on reasoned explanation (with or without evidence), and take a dim view of both tag-pulling and whining. When left to my own devices, I resort to the following: Affirmatives should have some significance. If they want to win, it should outweigh disads. Affirmatives also should be inherent, whatever that means. When two arguments evidentially contradict, I throw them both out. When they analytically contradict, I do the same unless one (a) successfully defends them conditionally, (b) chooses one and kisses the other goodby, or (c) explains why I ought keep the better of the two. More and more, I rue the trend toward self-serving theory arguments, esp. by affirmatives, e.g., that counterplans are illegitimate, that if topicality is a prior issue it must therefore be the only issue, and virtually all punishment arguments. While I continue to believe that there are grounds for legitimate debate on paradigm theory, which I welcome, many theory positions appear to be more an excuse for avoiding the library and for refusing to engage in substantive policy dispute. I find the appeals to "fairness" and "educational value" made on behalf of such positions increasingly distasteful.

2) **Topicality:** I enjoy well-conceived arguments and, while generally liberal, often vote on those to which negatives are willing to devote necessary energy. "Resolved: That" are the only unimportant terms in the resolution. I doubt that any terms are mass nouns. I tend to sever extratopical plan planks unless told to do otherwise. I believe that better definitions do exist, to be determined by argument. I prefer topicality disputes that revolve around definitions, not standards.

3) **Counterplans:** They often are a good idea, whether defended as policy or conditionally (presuming that one wins the relevant theory). They should not be topical. In my heart of hearts, I am skeptical of most negative positions on competitiveness, especially on topics such as this, where no agent is specified, and tend to look for mutual exclusivity of plan with those parts of counterplan that gain the added negative advantages. But I can be persuaded to vote for less. Those who advocate "legal theory of the week" counterplans will encounter resistance. I tend to view permutations as only a test of competition, not as an amendment to the plan. Counterwarrants are a questionable notion, theoretically and pragmatically; I've voted for them, but you should know that it won't be easy.

4) **Disco:** All prima facie burdens must be met by 1AC, but what this means is an open question; affirmatives certainly have an additional constructive in which to present material, just as negatives need not present topicality in 1NC. Negatives who want to win should not drop add-ons or turns. Turns should be labelled as such in both affirmative rebuttals, and should stem from topical plan planks. I do not necessarily object to the jettisoning of arguments, subject to my aversion to new arguments in rebuttal, and particularly in 2AR; therefore, teams should not wait until the last moment to be clever.

5) **Style:** Debaters should have some. I dislike intensely those who are rude, inconsiderate, or patronizing. I read evidence infreqently, and only when I need or want to, not necessarily when I am asked to. CX is not a tag-team event, and should be used for something more valuable than asking for evidence or missed responses, or otherwise conserving prep time. Evasion is not clever, merely annoying.

6) **Other:** Both evidentiary integrity and groundless accusations are voting issues. I concur with Yogi Berra: "It ain't over 'til it's over." Coverage in 1AR is important, as is issue selection in 2NR and 2AR. I expect the final rebuttalists to crystallize, lest my own capriciousness prevail. I do not reveal decisions.

NAME: STEPHEN G. LARSON

INSTITUTION: UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW CENTER

NUMBER OF ROUNDS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 25

---

1. Decision making paradigm: I suppose the paradigm that best describes my judging "philosophy" would be that of "policy making", although I am susceptible to voting for any paradigm so long as it is well-explained, defended, and applied. Absent a standard established by one or both teams, I will generally treat the affirmative plan as a legislative policy (or judicial decision) and weigh the relevant advantages and disadvantages of implementing that policy or decision. Significance, harm, solvency and disadvantages all are factored in to such a calculation. I will vote on inherency if given a reason to do so, although assuming a problem exists, there is a presumption of inherency with the affirmative.

2. Topicality: Topicality as determined by the "better definition" standard is an absolute voting issue. I despise blurby topicality arguments, and implore the use of analysis and evidence in presenting such arguments. Extratopical plan provisions are to be severed.

3. Counterplans: While I personally feel the only legitimate standard of competitiveness is mutual exclusivity, I will listen to any standard the negative has to offer. Conditional counterplans are suspect, but I have voted for them more times than I would care to admit. Topical or non-competitive counterplans generally fall out of the round, although I will entertain suggestions by both sides that they be incorporated into the affirmative plan. Counterwarrants and justification arguments are used in desperation.

4. Add-ons/Turnarounds/disco: All these are fine so long as they are explained and appropriately evidenced. I will give 2NR and 2AR more leeway in making new arguments when such strategies are employed. 2AR has a heavy burden of presumption to overcome if he/she is going to disco in the last speech.

5. Style and other issues: Speed does not bother me, assuming I can understand what is being said. I will read evidence after the round if directed to do so, or if there is substantive controversy concerning the content of a particular piece of evidence. I will not reread entire disadvantages or arguments. I think all debaters should dress decently and behave civilly, but far be it from me to impose such subjective personal standards on others. I am particularly annoyed at interruption of speeches, speakers who answer questions directed at their partners and argumentum ad hominem. I am very open to new and innovative arguments, and strongly encourage the use of imagination and creativity during the debate.

Karla Leeper
UT Austin
2 years experience
10 tournaments

T- It is always a voting issue. It is never a reverse voting issue. I am increasingly annoyed with endless standards debates and no-analysis violations. Spend more time on the violation and its aplication to the affirmative plan. There are some T violations on this topic which are just plain false, i.e. 'the Supreme court is not a federal court' and 'the word on means in support of'. I'm not sure I could bring myself to vote for these arguments even if dropped by the aff.

Decisionmaking Paradigm-I fall somewhere between the policy-making and advocacy paradigms. I dislike anything resembling hypotesting. I also intensely dislike conditional argumentation.

Inherency-As long as the plan has not been adopted, the aff. is inherent.

Standard of significance- I have no real standard. I do realize however, that this is a value topic and that aff. advantages are more likely to be nebulous.

C-X- Don't be a jerk. Ask questions, don't give diatribes. Answer your own questions and not your partners. Don't be a jerk.

Evidence Standards-Misuse of evidence is a serious breach of ethics and will result in a loss and 0 speaker points. An unsubstantiated challenge will result in the same.

CP's- Counterplans should be non-topical and competitive. The counterplan should be non-topical by the same standards which make the affirmative topical. There are really only two true tests of competition: mutual exclusivity and net benefits. Permutations are only a test of competition and as such they need not be topical and do not require plan amendment. Agent of action counterplans are poor imitations of a real counterplan. Prioritization CP's and the like are glorified studies options and are no more non-topical or competitive. Make sure you dispose of your counterplan if you choose not to extend it. Left to my own devices I am inclined to let 2AR use it as a disco dance floor.

Counterwarrants- We debate the plan, not the resolution, Hence counterwarrants are irrelevant. This view also meansthat justification and hasty generalizations are not relevant.

Add ons, Turnarounds, Disco-Swell. Discos must be reasonably foreseeable.

ETC- One of my pet peeves is debaters who fail to listen to the other team. Listen to the evidence in the positions and don't play garanimal debate. These types of teams typically grant the link to linkless DA's and try to turn them (in vain). I am increasingly convinced that the quality of negative arghuments on this topic could allow the 2AC to do his speech without reading one.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

ALLAN LOUDEN, DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS - WAKE FOREST UNIV. - 15 YEARS COACHING - JUDGED 5 TOURNAMENTS

I. **DECISIONAL PERSPECTIVE:** Policy debate ought to compare policies - the Aff. plan(s) and the Neg. "plan(s)" which must serve as a reason not act. Thus, in most round I end-up adding-up **a consistent** position for each team. Earlier in the round teams may take either/or positions but in the end should **advocate** a wholistic rationale. It is my perspective that teams, knowingly or unknowingly, provide a narrative of a course of action. When evaluating I try to fit the parts together ins ome kind of reasoned whole and I appreciate teams who assist me in that process. It is impossible for a critic to achieve the objectivity of a computer and a dangerous illusion when we act as if we could. could. Hence, I do evaluate **quality of argument** (claim + reason), try to avoid cheap shots in resolving rounds, and reject tabula rasa absolutism. From this perspective the minutia of line-by-line argument is not nearly as important as the overall framework within which the sub-claims take place. Functionally, an argument only becomes an argument when it is **explained and placed into a context.**

II. **TOPICALITY:** Strategically topicality is often useful in defining other issues in a round but I seldom vote on what is usually spurious gaming. If you plan on winning topicality it should be seriously pursued. While the above is my disposition I will (and do) vote on the issue. Affirmative definitions are "best" if they "reasonably" promote debatability.

III. **RELEVANT DISPOSITIONS: Counterplans** - The plan and not the resolution is the locus of choice. Consequently, CPs must compete, net-benefits is the operational standard applied, and permutations only serve to demonstrate false comparisons. I am unsympathetic to CPs which assume fiat conditions outside the 1st Aff's purview (i.e, "utopian" alternatives). I appreciate Aff. argumentation which exposes the hypothetical assumptions which remove positions like "instantaneous benign Socialism" from the political reality in which the Supreme Court make decisions. CPs can be topical as long as they compete - the plan, not the resolution is the boundary of comparison. **Counter-warrants**? Give me a break - the plan is the focus. **Disadvantages** must meet a threshold of probability before they are weighed. Decision makers do not act or fail to act on consequences which although "possible" are highly "improbable." Argumentative **fairness** determines legitimacy of new positions in rebuttals and discos. New constructions are "fair" when they respond to new DA links, impacts, etc. in 2NC and disco, cross-apps, and other opportunism are "fair" when they could have been reasonable anticipated. That is, "new constructions in summation which grow out of the positions (liberally construed) in constructives are fine."

IV. **STYLE:** A fundamental element in models of persuasion is comprehension. Stylistic considerations of speed, evidence specification, and degree of explanation are, therefore, best thought of as audience dependent variables. That is, judges vary in their experience with topic specific arguments and intricacies of theory which affect their ability to comprehend your intent. Comprehension for me is not so much a matter of speed but rather one of explanation. Take the time to state the thesis of positions you take in the debate or accept the fact that I cannot be persuaded by what I do not understand.

I personally think **cross-examination** is one of the most underestimated and abused opportunities in debate. It can easily direct the flow of a round and "expose" absurd positions. Teams which view C-X as little more than "prep-time" or systematically refuse to seriously ask or answer questions are less than impressive.

Steve Mancuso, The University of Michigan 10 tournaments
Debate Coach, 3 years of coaching

1. I am NOT, repeat, NOT tabula rasa on certain key questions of theory.

Topicality. The only standard which I consider relevant is the debatability of the affirmative interpretation. To me, topicality serves as a convention specifically adapted to debate, to encourage debates where both sides are prepared. The negative must win that the affirmative approach/definition would lead to an extremely large and virtually undebatable set of cases or plans. Consequently, affirmative cases that have been run a large part of the year, or are easily found in the core of the first amendment literature, enjoy very strong presumption with me, if defended on those grounds.

Counterplans. Counterplans must be "net benefit" competitive, meaning that they must be proven superior to the plan and the combination of the plan plus all or part of the counterplan.

Permutations. Permutations of the plan plus part of the counterplan enjoy the same broad "fiat" power that the counterplan enjoyed. For example, the affirmative can legitimately fiat adoption of 99.9% of anarchy or authoritarianism, plus do the plan, and not have to worry about "political backsliding" or the "precedent" that would be set for further exceptions to the counterplan. Negatives that demand that I suspend (and I mean really suspend) reality to imagine the nonviolent, immediate, easy, blissful transition to a world without government, must be prepared for me to suspend political reality for the permutation. Translation: I will not be a very good judge for the "change of government" counterplans.

Decision Rules. I will not be a slave to counter-intutitive decision rules just because a team can read a card. Debaters can overcome my predispositions toward certain values, but only through analysis. Warning: if there is one area where I tend to impose my own values on the debate, it is this area. What are said values? "Bleeding-heart leftist" would be a fair, 3-word summary.

2. Mechanics/Strategy

I will allow 1ARs to make brand new responses to negative positions that were advanced in the 1NC as long as they are consistent with their 2AC positions. It seems this is a fair way to counteract the increasingly oppressive negative block. After all, it is a "rebuttal" speech to the negative constructive position.

I will not allow the 2AR to "disco" or put the debate into a new configuration without some detailed warning of this possibility in the 1AR.

I will not call for evidence that I cannot understand during its initial presentation. Speakers that make an effort to be persuasive will earn higher speaker points than their purely technical proficiency justifies.

1987 NDT JUDGING PHILOSOPHY FORM

Christopher McMahon University of Utah
Assistant Coach 1 year coaching experience
Number of Tournaments judged at this year: 14

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I am open to any paradigm advanced by the debaters in the round as long as it is clear and well argued. However, left to my own devices, I will adopt a policymaking/legislative paradigm. In this event, I apply cost-benefit analysis in evaluating arguments at the end of the round. I am not adverse to other paradigms, but I must be given a reason to adopt them. I am not a big fan of punishment paradigms, and tend to give alot of leeway in terms of what I'll listen to. I try not to intervene in the round at all, thus it is important for teams to pick and choose their arguments clearly, especially in rebuttals. The team that best crystalizes their position and goes for the key arguments is more likely to get my ballot than one that covers every argument at a superficial level. I prefer to hear disads. that make some intuitive sense. Thus, I give rights disads. with small impacts as much credence as big sig. disads, especially since most of these types of disads. have tenuous links at best.

TOPICALITY: I tend to give affirmatives alot of leeway on topicality. This is evident, since I've only voted on T. twice this year. However, I believe topicality to be the only prior issue in the round. I am particularly unimpressed with the Supreme Court is not a federal court and court decisions are not restrictions arguments. This type of T. argument will get no sympathy from me! I evaluate topicality by the standards presented in the round, but usually err on the side of reasonability.

COUNTERPLANS: Counterplans are fine with me, but I prefer that they be nontopical and competitive. For me net benefits and mutual exclusivity are the best tests of competitiveness. I do not like the "glitch in the system" competitiveness argument. This only indicates to me that the counterplan has serious significance problems. Perms are fine. I see them as tests of competitiveness for the plan only, thus they should be topical, and have some logical basis in the plan. Again, the "glitch in the system" permutation would seem to indicate that the plan has no significance, and this does not seem to be the wisest strategy.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: These strategies are all fine, as long as they are clearly argued. I will not make these arguments for the debaters at the end of the round. Thus, double flips must be labelled as such, turns must identified, etc., etc.. Crossapplications in rebuttals are fine by me as long as they have some basis in reality, and are not merely cleverly disguised responses that are new in 2AR. Flips should really be flips, not just takeouts labelled as flips in the hopes of gaining more impact.

STYLE: I have absolutely no problem with speed. However, I do have a problem with incomprehensible speed. I will read evidence after the round, but will not read cards that are totally incomprehesible. Moreover, I would like to see analysis in the spread, not just mindless blurbs.

Star A. Muir, Director of Debate
University of Pittsburgh
Seven years of coaching
Judged at three tournaments this year

Realistically, you are facing someone with an above average grasp of debate theory and strategy, a middling ability to flow a quick speech, and a tendency to be confused in an unclear round. Confusion is directly related to the amount of intervention I will take, clarity is therefore a key element in maintaining your voice in the decision-making process.

1) I feel myself to be a reasonable and interested citizen/judge, evaluating both procedural and substantive questions to determine what my best options are at the end of the round. I dislike most of the extreme interpretations of the traditional paradigms--numerous unexplained hypothetical alternatives to the topic, for example, or the sometimes forced rigidity of two-policy comparison--but as citizen/judge, I can view the world from as many different scientific, legislative, international, individualistic, and/or trans-paradigmatic perspectives as are reasonably justified in the round.

2) I do not relish listening to topicality arguments when they are intended as timewasters against cases that are clearly central to the topic. One-liners with little depth of analysis and no intelligent application as a substantive rationale for a decision, whether coming from the negative or the affirmative, are rarely a basis for decision. I try to balance my aversion to extratopicality arguments and my distaste for page after page of plan spikes.

3) I prefer a well-explained and justified competitiveness standard to the list of unclear and generally irrelevant taglines that are excuses for an intelligent discussion of counterplan competition. Permutation analysis, from past experience, plays a large role in isolating competitive portions of the counterplan and therefore facilitates intrinsic advantage comparison. Re-planning, or counter-counter-planning, is most effective as a tool for hypothetically demonstrating how counterplan advantages are not intrinsic to the competitive portions of the counterplan. Topicality of counterplans is still a grey area for me. Intuitively, the negative should not be allowed to advocate resolutional action, yet I generally require (and certainly prefer) clash at the level of the specified example and not at the resolution.

4) Add-ons and turnarounds are all part of the round evaluation; I like them to be clear and at least reasonably coherent when initially introduced. Disco I like to have some prior warning on; I reserve the right to intervene and pass judgment on the acceptability of abrupt changes of position, especially in the last rebuttals.

5) I like relaxed and fun rounds, and I like to hear intelligent analysis delivered clearly at an intelligible rate. I will read evidence as necessary after a round. I don't react well to "reverse voting issues" and "punishment"--I will vote on them if absolutely forced to, but prefer not to. I am ultimately a reasonable person, trying to make the best possible choices as I am confronted with the issues in the round.

Marietta College
Chartered in 1835

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY Years Coaching: 7

Dennis J. Murphy

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I view debate as a game. In the game spirit, I am willing to become whatever both teams wish me to become. I lean more heavily to the policy making paradigm and I am most uncomfortable with the hypothesis testing paradigm. I have no real bias against hypo-testing per se but the way I have seen it advanced recently has not gained my favor.

While I will assume many roles as a judge, I do not believe in the punishment paradigm or reverse voting issues (whatever they are!). I am not a tabula rasa judge. Just because a debater puts out twenty decision rules or voting issues and the opposition fails to deny them as voting issues, I will not vote on them if they do not carry with them the impact to justify the ballot. In short, it is not a voting issue simply because you say it is.

I do not like to intervene in the round regarding issues. I like teams that set up standards to weigh arguments. If, at the end of the round, there are issues "all over the place," with no special importance attatched to them, then I will weigh them myself. I do this with great discomfort but it is the debater's fault if my evaluation of the round is not to his or her agreement. I have no problem with generic disadvantages but the links damn better be there. I will not vote on high impact no probability disadvantages.

TOPICALITY: It is a voting issue--pure and simple. Everything else is debateable. I do not like topicality arguments that are obviously a waste of time.

COUNTERPLANS: My preference for competitiveness standards is wide. I like net benefits, mutual exclusivity or redundancy. I will listen to others. I do not like counterplans that simply ban the affirmative--a bit artificial eh? My bias is against alternate forms of government counterplans. I'm certain I will vote on one some day, but they are probably 0-10 with me as a judge. Topical counterplans lose the round. I have no bias either way on counter-warrants.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: I have no problem with any of these. The affirmative must carry some case significance. They cannot "bag" their advantages and win on only a turnaround. Discos are risky but I'll accept them. You better be right when you "go long" on these.

STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES: Speed is not a problem--clarity is. If I don't understand a response it isn't in the round. I do not care what your partner says you said. Please number!! I despise, " 1.____, Next...." Learn to count to two!!!!!

$1B$51

BILL NEWMAN, Emory University
9 years coaching, 7 tournaments, 26 rounds

MANWENS MELLOW FELLOW MODEL

PARADIGMATIC IDIOSYNCRATIC: Believing myself to be a reasonable person, I still deep in my heart envision debates as lively exchanges between intelligent, rational, and thoughtful human beings over issues of social importance. Absent that, I listen to NDT. I, like most judges, do my best to keep my personal biases out of the debate. I try to evaluate debates within the parameters established by the debaters, whether they be explicit or implicit. As an example of implicit standards, I do not believe topicality of a counterplan to be particularly important. However, it is clear in the argumentation of most debates that debaters assume a topical counterplan to be a potential reason to vote Affirmative. I would operate within that constraint until someone in the debate effectively argues otherwise.

ARGUMENTATIVE BIASES (Counterplans, intrinsicness, topicality, etc.): Left to my own devices with unclear standards these are my biases. I believe that Affirmatives are trying to justify their proof of the resolution as being true. The negative's job is to disprove that particular proof. Thus, topical, but competitive COUNTERPLANS are legitimate. When an affirmative argues for a PERMUTATION, I believe they are merely arguing that the counterplan does not compete with the Affirmative's proof of the topic. If the permutation is topical, it merely becomes yet another proof of the statement. It seems as though all STANDARDS OF COMPETITION collapse to net benefit. I still believe that there must be some mutually exclusive counterplan out there; we just haven't seen any in about five years. It also seems to me that a nontopical redundant counterplan would be sufficient to prove that the resolutional action need not be taken. In all honesty, however, I have heard very few counterplans which I thought were competitive with the plans of this resolution. I also find that arguments which indicate that a disadvantage is not INTRINSIC to supporting the resolution are acceptable. However, a list of twenty alternative means which might stop the disadvantage is hardly persuasive. I think there needs to be more substantive discussion of why the disadvantage is not intrinsic and some proof beyond judicial notice that certain policies could solve it. While I have accepted the argument that the affirmative does not have to be TOPICAL, it was only by a negative team's error and not a judge's resolution of a contentious argument. The ONLY argument that I find I CANNOT vote for under nearly any circumstance is PUNISHMENT.

TOPICAL OBSERVATIONS: I must confess that I am disappointed in the form of argument on this topic. While I have certainly encouraged and/or defended the use of many of the arguments being run (anarchy, socialism, rights malthus, etc.), I must say I find the rampant use of the MEATBALL on this topic extremely dissappointing. Debaters have stuck with the same arguments on a topic that they did not fit. There is no agent nor clear form of action specified in the topic. The topic is written so narrowly confined to the first amendment that there is little spillover into other rights issues except as they compete with first amendment interests. And the topic seems to allow the affirmative to discuss a narrow range of First Amendment issues at their choosing. Nonetheless, negatives seem to pounce on Affirmatives with the assumption that they can link a meatball. I find most affirmatives tend to jump into the fray and say "no, we don't cause the destruction of the planet by letting George Carlin say 'piss, shit, cocksucker, motherfucker and tits' on the radio, we save the world from a race to death." This is inane. But you guys are all playing by the same rules so it continues to happen. I believe that some smart, innovative, and smooth negative teams could win some debates without this by arguing some of these cases straight-up, making the affirmative defend their case, etc. I am begging someone to try because I find mutual acceptance of linkless wonders leading to poor argumentation and repetitive, boring debates. More specifically, I find that most cases are topical although I suppose the most threatening TOPICALITY VIOLATIONS is whether or not the restricted communication is in actuality a First Amendment freedom of speech. Many seem to be legislative freedoms or not protected speech. Most press cases I have heard seem to be topical on that ground. The other topicality argument which seems to be strong is whether or not the restriction is established in a federal court. It seems as though in many cases the restriction is established in legislatures or state courts theoretically consistent with a restriction established in a federal court. However, many of these derivative restrictions may not be topical. To be frank I have not heard a single COUNTERPLAN which I thought was competitive. I have not heard any rounds where the issue of whether or not one or two individuals imprisoned for exercising their first amendment rights was SIGNIFICANT but I would probably be receptive to strong arguments which indicated it was questionable. Please bear in mind that these are MY OBSERVATIONS. I will, however, evaluate these arguments according to the way they are ARGUED IN THE DEBATE.

STYLE: I prefer to think of myself as a non-interventionary judge. I think that has made me a dinosaur in contemporary debate. So be it. If an opponent places a reasonable burden upon you, regarding the sufficiency of your argument or evidence, you need to respond. I have been in several rounds this year where under some circumstances the response was merely "pull our evidence." This is not an answer. I will not try to decipher evidence unless there is no choice. It is your responsibility to explain why you win an argument not mine to explain it to the other team for you. Otherwise, I expect you to be clear, precise, friendly, and considerate to your opponent and judges. I have been known to give extremely low points for extreme violations of these norms. Please feel free to argue as you see fit, but enjoy debating and make it a joy for the rest of us if you can.

den

NAME: Don Nichols
SCHOOL: Odessa College
POSITION: Director Of Forensics
YEARS COACHING: 25
Judged at 9 Tournaments in 1986-1987

PARADIGM: As a judge, I see myself as a trained critic and educator who evaluates the arguments as presented. I will accept a specific paradigm, and weigh the issues accordingly, if it is determined by the debate. If no paradigm is offered, I will use a policy making approach. For me, procedural issues are not debatable, such as whether or not topicality is a voting issue, time limits, or sides, Etc.; but substanative issues such as whether or not First Amendment freedoms should be curtailed or expanded is very debatable. I prefer evaluative, articulative, and intelligent argumentation as opposed to blips.

TOPICALITY: To be quite honest, I rarely vote on topicality unless it is a well developed violation. I do, however, prefer topical cases and am sympathetic to the negative who is challenging an abusive case. I beleive it is an a priori jurisdictional question to be evaluated before other substanative issues. I beleive that the Better Definition Standard should be accepted as valid in a given round. I am not usually receptive to "reverse voting issues" and find them intellectually abusive.

COUNTERPLANS/COUNTERWARRANTS: Counterplans must be non-topical and competitive. I prefer counterplans that clash with the affirmative significance. I tend to give affirmatives some leeway about permutations, as long as they prove that the adoption of the plan first will not harm the success of the counterplan. Because permutation theory has yet to solidify, I am open to negative argumentation against the theory. I prefer to hear clash of substanative issues rather than unresolvable blips. I will listen to counterwarrant/hasty generalization positions, but I tend to give the affirmative some leeway in this area. I tend to believe that one solid case is sufficient evidence that the resolution is probably true in a given debate round.

INHERENCY: Although inherency is really blended with topicality on this particulair topic, inherency may still be a voting issue in the round.

SOLVENCY/SIGNIFICANCE: Not only must the affirmative acquire some advantage, but that advantage must be reasonable enough to over come presumption against change.

DEBATOR RESPONSIBILITIES: (1) The ethical standard is to present the evidence in the most accurate form possible. Citations should be available if requested. (2) Incomprehensibility is a problem. I beleive that the argumentation and the evidence should be clear within the confines of the round. If I cannot understand either your argument or evidence, they will not be weighed into my decision. A critic can evaluate only what he understands, and it is the debators responsibility to be clear. (3) I abhor "tag team" debating in cross examination or during speeches. I believe it detracts from the educational aspects of the activity as well as fairness.

Number of years coaching: 1
Number of tournaments: 10

Jeff Parcher
George Mason University

I ascribe to no particular paradigm. I will accept any paradigm the debaters wish to argue for. However, I rarely find paradigm arguments to be of much importance in making a decision. At the end of the round I generally weigh advantages and disadvantages including turns and any other argument baring on the desireability of the plan/resolution.

I have found a number of topicality arguments to be very persuasive this year. I treat topicality like any other argument in the debate. Absent arguments to the contrary, I vote for the most desireable construction of the topic. A well applied standard can be useful, in most debates they are not. I prefer anaylsis concerning the implications of each construction of the topic, here is where standards get my attention.

Counterplans may be conditional as well as the affirmative mandates. I dislike conditionality bad debates. There are much higher goals for debate than punishment and deterence, hence I am unlikely to vote in favor of such unless the violation is particularly disgusting. That is true whether the issue is topicality, conditionality or whatever. Most counterplans fail on my ballot for lack of competition. I believe that net benefits is the only true standard of competition. I have voted for others. As of yet, I have heard no persuasive argument for the general illegitimacy of permutations. I have voted against permutations which substantially alter the affirmative plan as presented. If neither team, prior to the 2AR makes an argument otherwise, I usually disregard a topical counterplan whether conditional or not. Unless a counterplan is properly dropped out of the debate, I believe the affirmative is allowed to assume adoption of the counterplan and all the implications which follow.

Disadvantages which demonstrate a high risk but low probability tend on my ballot to outweigh low significance cases. I tend to vote for the least risky position - this places a higher premium on the avoidance of harm than on the achieving of all together new benefits. Consciousness, political or otherwise, is as persuasive to me as any other type of benefit or harm. This presumes, however, that the evidence is understandable and explainable. Often evidence on this type of issue is ambiguous and overclaimed.

So far, I am unaware of any particular stylistic aversion I may have. Like anyone else, I do not usually enjoy being yelled at. Speaker points on my ballot typically reflect analytical skills rather than presentational skills.

I intend to follow the rules of the NDT.

David Pelham
Director of Forensics
Tournaments Judged this year: 6

Central Michigan University
Years Coaching: 6

I probably would describe myself as a critic of argument rather than a strict policy maker, hypo tester, etc. I try not to overtly intervene in the round. However, I do consider the degree to which an argument is developed rather than just the impact of the argument. I am much more likely to vote for an argument that is adequately explained in the round than one that has a greater impact but is little more than a tagline.

I tend to believe that topicality is a voting issue at any tournament but especially at the NDT. I typically find topicality to be unsatisfactorily argued in most debates. If the negative expects to win this issue I believe that they must not only establish criteria for judging topicality but must defend it as being the superior one in the round. Most debaters argue the standards but with very little direct clash between aff and neg standards.

Given a choice, I do not care for conditional arguments. But if a team is willing to let their opponents get away with it so am I. I prefer mutual exclusivity as a standard of competitiveness and believe that topical counterplans are subsumed into the aff.

I have no problem with turnarounds or add-ons. In both cases the arguments must be explained. I do not vote for taglines, no matter how loudly they are shouted. I have basically the same view of discoing. If the strategy is explained I am willing to vote on this maneuver (except in 2AR). But I refuse to fill in the gaps in the debaters explanations.

I really have a problem with debaters that never look up from their flow. This is still an oral activity. Also, failure to attempt to determine if the judge is following you seems to be a fairly silly strategy. I do not give a lot of feedback because it is so easily misread, but if I am looking around my flow, flipping pages during arguments, etc. you can assume that you have lost me. Debaters that hit one level of volume and pitch in the beginning of their speech and alter that delivery only by increasing the volume are not very interesting to listen to. I vote for boring debaters but I tend to not give them very high speaker points. As far as links on disads are concerned... have some. They don't have to be great but they do have to be argued.

If I were to give my debaters advice on how to debate in front of me I would tell them three things. He is impressed with debaters that are willing to leave there briefs to point out flaws in their opponents arguments. He likes to see debaters have courage enough to make some choices in rebuttals rather than simply trying to see how much they can keep in the round in hopes that someone will make a mistake. And finally, he likes debaters that know the difference between setting up arguments in cross ex and making arguments in cross ex. The former is preferred.

1986-87 Judging Philosophy

Neil Phillips
Debate Coach
Ten tournaments judged at prior to Districts

University of Northern Iowa
Ten years of coaching

I decided several years ago that I must like judging debates or I wouldn't be doing so much of it. As I continued the process of rationalizing my behaviors, I decided that I liked debate because of the intellectual and rigorous testing of ideas that occurs anew within each round and that I can best serve this activity by suspending my disbeliefs, adopting an objective stance towards the debate and debaters, and by trying to evaluate the qualitative differences among the arguments for the purpose of helping the advocates improve. To that end, I function as an argumentation critic and as an educator. As an audience, I always intervene in the process, although I dislike overt intervention or having to build the framework for my decision because none of the debaters did. I also like debates on this year's topic in which the debaters remember to discuss the assumptions behind the Constitution and the First Amendment.

Although I seldom seem to vote on it, I think topicality is always a voting issue preemptive of all other substantive issues in the debate and is never a reverse voter when conceded. I don't know how the "best" definition is derived, although a "better" one can be found through a comparative process. I find the direct comparison of definitions much more profitable ground than battles over standards. I like affirmatives who talk about speech or press and not just expression or other parts of the First Amendment. I have my doubts about affirmatives who think a chill is enough of a restriction to meet the topic.

I expect a counterplan to be nontopical and to compete with the affirmative area. I tend to give affirmatives much leeway on permutations and to dislike most change of government counterplans because they seldom directly force a philosophical choice of policy systems. I have hung around Henderson enough that I think all arguments are conditional and think that the negative can jettison a counterplan which is noncompetitive or topical. Affirmatives don't seize it, it just goes away like a disproven disadvantage. However, negatives who jettison give affirmatives much ground to argue about the intrinsic nature of generic disadvantages. I do dislike blip counterplans whose single purpose is to make a disadvantage unique. I do expect to be able to make a decision by the end of the debate, so negatives are warned to reach towards some consistent grounding for their positions.

I have nothing against add-ons, turnarounds, or underhanded tactics (given, of course, fair warning). Clever strategies that work are rewarded; failures are costly. I do dislike rebuttal shifts, clever and unpredictable cross applications in 2AR, and negatives who continue to maintain contradictory positions at the end of the debate. Disadvantages and counterplan net benefits may become affirmative land if so claimed early enough in the debate.

Fast talkers are okay by me, although I discovered that I cannot keep up when "argument" is operationalized as a five word tag with no substance. Arguments don't necessarily require evidence, but they at least require some reasoning. The purpose of rebuttals should be to clarify and extend positions. People who spread until the last minute seldom achieve this goal. I seldom look at evidence. If I don't catch it the first time, I consider it the fault of the debater and not me. Tag team debate and tag team answering in cross examination bothers me significantly. Finally, I would add that "roadmapping" is either prep time or speaking time, but it comes out of somebody's time.

David Rhaesa (Racy)
Dartmouth College

3rd Year Judging
[redacted] 12 Tournaments

Topicality--I feel topicality debate is somewhat better this year. The main difference is that debaters are not becoming as caught up in standards debates and arguing more about the limits and debatability of the affirmative definitions. *Traditional "standards" arguments almost never are a basis for my decision.* Rather, the teams that discuss the merits of the definitions that are read in the debate are likely to persuade me. This discussion may incorporate similar arguments as the standards debate but in a concrete form (as applied to the violation) rather than abstract discussions about the values of broad versus limited topics.

Counterplans--The traditional burden of *non-topicality* may be reasonably questioned by the negative. *Conditional counterplans* are usually OK. Numerous one line counterplans, however, increase the credibility of abuse arguments. *Competition.* Mutually exclusivity is really a type of net benefit. Competition is not a jurisdictional argument - rather it is a question of the probability of a net benefit. *Permutations.* Some of them are clearly legitimate. Don't bother reading your block on permutations illegitimate. If some of the arguments apply to specific permutations point them out where they apply. I believe many time of adoption permutations avoid clash. I also feel there is a fundamental difference between arguging a permutation of the counterplan in combination with the entirety of the affirmative plan and arguing the counterplan can exist with a permutation of the affirmative plan. *Counterplans probably get FIAT as do permutations.* The latter seems a telling deficiency of many agent of action counterplans.

Theory in General--Most theory debate is completely divorced from the other arguments in the debate. I would rather relevant theory be explained within the internal development of the arguments to which they relate. I think theories which allow one team to make arguments but deny a reciprocal right to their opponents are fundamentally unfair. Thus, I have problems with the argument that all negative arguments are inherently conditional - but it's because we're negative so the affirmative must not be conditional. There may be one or two real arguments on debaters' "agent of action" briefs but I'd rather not hear the other ten non-arguments.

Other things-- I think the biggest weakness in debate is the lack of internal development of arguments. I reward teams which discuss the missing internal links and thresholds of disadvantages and advantages. I often vote against high threshold arguments on a couple link presses. I don't reward teams that answer good analysis with briefs which don't apply. I would rather here debaters that make arguments which reflect some thought than mindless brief reading.

JACK RHODES
DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS
10-12 tournaments this year

MIAMI UNIVERSITY OF OHIO
24 years coaching experience

PARADIGMS: If left to my own devices, I consider myself a policy-maker in the round. I hope the teams will set up the paradigm(s) they wish considered in the course of the debate, however. Of course I also consider myself a critic of arguments. I think debate is a strategic maneuver much like a game of chess or bridge and that debaters should consider where they wish to get by executing a particular tactic. All issues are debatable in the round, and I try not to let my personal feelings on a subject influence my decision as to the progress of the arguments actually advanced in the round. If an argument is important, it should be labelled as important by the speaker.

TOPICALITY: It is not a voting issue with me unless it is argued as a voting issue. It should be decided first: that is, if I decide the case is not within my jurisdiction, I will not pay attention to the rest of the arguments because this becomes a prior issue. But it must be argued as such by the debaters for me to resolve it this way. On Topicality I suppose my paradigm is not that of policy-maker but that of legal judge. Topicality is a burden for the Affirmative to meet, but if they do not meet it (in my view), and the Negative is not persuasive in arguing that it isn't met, I can still easily ignore it and go Affirmative on remaining issues.

COUNTERPLANS: They should be mutually exclusive if possible. I will listen to other arguments such as net benefits and philosophical competitiveness, but I admit that these seem harder for Negatives to convince me about. A topical counterplan would normally weigh in favor of the Affirmative -- if they convince me that it is topical, and if they claim the counterplan for themselves. Permutation theory is still in its infancy but seems reasonable. Counter-warrants do not seem particularly well-suited to this topic.

MISCELLANEOUS: I think I have an Affirmative bias this year that should be admitted: if it seems like a good idea and there are no compelling disadvantages, I tend to vote for the case. 2NR's are therefore well-advised to consolidate to one or two compelling reasons why I should not vote Affirmative. They should close the doors on 2AR by arguing against new arguments that were not covered in 1AR. They should not try to get my ballot by going for a number of little issues but should package voting issues clearly in 2NR. If they do not, 2AR is allowed wide latitude (and will probably take it) in answering Negative arguments.

I appreciate courtesy and good manners in a round, coupled with strategic sensible choices, sound arguments, and a competitive spirit. I will normally not read evidence but will do so if the evidence itself becomes an ethical question in the round. If an argument is incomprehensible, I expect the opponents to label it as such; if they so label, and if I agree, I will probably disregard the argument, for I doubt that most policy-makers would vote on arguments they don't understand.

1987 NDT JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

DAVE RIEK

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

3 YEARS COACHING

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I FEEL THAT DEBATE IS A PERSUASIVE ACTIVITY, AND SO I VOTE FOR THE TEAM THAT GIVES THE BEST ARGUMENTS FOR MY VOTE. I CAN BE CONVINCED THAT I SHOULD BE A POLICY MAKER OR A HYPOTHESIS TESTER, BUT I DO HAVE THE BASIC 'STOCK ISSUES' TATOOED ON MY GENES. IF I AM NOT OFFERED A PARADIGM BY THE TEAMS IN THE ROUND THEN I WILL EXERCISE MY OWN, ADMITTEDLY WARPED, PERSPECTIVE WHICH MAY LEAD TO UNEXPECTED RESULTS.

TOPICALITY: I AM PICKY ON THIS ISSUE. I EXPECT A CLEAR EXPLANATION OF STANDARDS VIOLATIONS AND REASONS TO VOTE ON 'T'. MY USUAL EVALUATION OF THE ISSUE WILL CENTER ON THE FAIRNESS OPF A GIVEN AFFIRMATIVE DEFINITION. IF AFFIRMATIVES, OR NEGATIVES FOR THAT MATTER ARE ABUSIVE IN THEIR DEFINITIONS, RESTRICTING GROUNDS UNFAIRLY, I WILL VOTE ON TOPICALITY.

COUNTERPLANS: LIKE TOPICALITY. I EXPECT TEAMS TO FOLLOW THE 'FORM' FOR COUNTERPLANS, INCLUDING 'T' AND COMPETITIVENESS. ON THIS TOPIC I EXPECT THE NEGATIVE TO PROVE THE EXCLUSIVITY OF THEIR COUNTERPLANS. IN PARTICULAR I AM INCLINED AGAINST 'SYSTEMS' COUNTERPLANS WHICH ARE TENUOUSLY LINKED TO RIGHTS.

ADD ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: I ADMIRE CREATIVE ARGUMENTATION. I ALSO ABHOR NEGATIVES WHO THINK THEY CAN WIN EVERYTHING IN 2NR. ALL ARGUMENTS MUST BE FULLY EXPLAINED FOR ME TO VOTE ON THEM, AND ONE LINE TAGS IN IAR DO NOT COUNT AS VOTING ISSUES.

I PREFER FRIENDY, ENERGETIC DEBATES. I HAVE, AND WILL CONTINUE TO DROP RUDE OR ABUSIVE DEBATE TEAMS, REGARDLESS OF THEIR REPUTATIONS. ALSO, I SHOULD MENTION THAT, DESPITE THE AFFIRMATIVE MY TEAM RUNS, I DO NOT THINK IT IS INTUITIVELY TRUE THAT FREEDOM OF SPEECH HAS ANY EFFECT ON THE BIOSPHERE OR NUCLEAR WAR. SO IF YOU MAKE THESE KIND OF ARGUMENTS YOU BETTER BE SURE TO, OVERCOME THIS DISSONANCE.

Joel Rollins, SMU, Director of Forensics, 3rd year, 8 tournaments

Explain your arguments and put the round together. It is the debaters' responsiblity to make and emphasize important arguments. Many debaters seem to think that saying something is enough; for me this is not true. If you think that something is important give it priority and emphasis. If the resolution of the debate is left up to me, I will vote my general feelings at that time... this is dangerous because my mood fluctuates depending on the round. The way to avoid my intervention is through emphasis, explanation, and establishment of criteria within the round.

What is an argument? A claim and a warrant constitute an argument. A claim does not constitute an argument. A one line dropped blip on "T is not a voting issue" is not likely to get you very far. You should not construe the above statement to be specific to topicality. This is an example only! Warrants can be evidence or your own reasons and analysis.

My general feelings on topicality. I deplore topicality run as a time waster. I have a general preference for "debatability" and the "best definition" standards, but these are only general biases. Other arguments are indeed welcome. I prefer to hear topicality debates that focus on the relationship between the standards and the violation rather than debates that treat the two as two separate and distinct entities. I like well developed topicality arguments, but I will rarely vote on poorly developed topicality. If 1N topicality is not clear as presented in the speech, then I will permit 2A to ask for leeway. Negatives should be able to give examples of cases that would be topical under their construction of the topic.

I prefer counterplans to justification arguments. If you insist on arguing justification it should be more than alternatives blurted out at warp speed. If you want to make justification a real argument you are going to have to spend time on it. I am still fuzzy about what I am suppossed to do with them even if you win them.

I like counterplans. I like non-topicality and competition in 1N. I don't like counterplans that are blipped out so fast that I'm left with "M/E" and "N/B" on my flow with no analysis or explanation following. Counterplans should be more than 30 second blips, especially if they tend to change the entire structure of our existence. I am not fond of conditional counterplans (or conditional arguments of any kind) but I do not proscribe them. Many times I'm not sure what to do with permutations so you all have the responsibility of telling me.

I love on point case argumentation, specific disadvantages, specific counterplans, and specific topicality arguments. I hate tenuously linked disads (or turn-arounds). However, I think many non-unique disads can go a long way on undercutting the value suppositions of insignificant cases. I do not think that there is such a thing as conditional evidentiary contradictions. I would prefer that debaters place themselves at some risk when making an argument. Style: speak in complete sentences. Explain your arguments. Power tagged evidence that is not even remotely close to the text borders on ethical violations. I dislike voting on underdeveloped arguments. If 1N runs a blip that ends up being the primary negative position; ask for leeway. I prefer debate on issues rather than the mere processing of tag lines and evidence through the time constrained system. Generally, I would prefer fewer arguments and more substantive debate.

Robert C. Rowland--Baylor University--ten years coaching

NDT debate is at a turning point. If the decline in participation continues (we have lost perhaps 100 out of the 200 programs that existed five or six years ago), NDT easily could die out, except for a few elite schools. At the same time, the quality of argument in NDT is often high and nearly everyone prefers the clearly defined stock issues of policy debate to the ill-defined constructs in value debate. Everyone in policy debate (coaches, judges, and especially debaters) needs to act as if the future of NDT debate depends on their actions. IT DOES!

To get at the problems we face, I have altered my judging philosophy. I no longer impose any restrictions on the debaters in a round, save the requirements of format, tournament rules, and the standards of the AFA. This does not mean that my views have changed, only that I want to try a different method of facilitating improvemnt in debate. I have listed below my preferences. If you follow them you are very likely to win and get high points.

1. I prefer a debate in which each side defends a single clear and consistent policy system. That system can have many parts, just as a counterplan or plan can have multiple planks, but it should be one system.

2. I prefer straight up debates on the case and plan. Counterplans are fine if they are adapted to the case. I do not like conditional arguments (counterplans, justification, counterwarrants, intrinsicness, or abuses of permutation) at all. If the opposing team argues that such positions destroy clash, violate time constraints, and encourage argumentative irresponsibility, then the team presenting the conditional position is very likely to lose the argument and perhaps the debate. But I will no longer impose my views (absent argument) on this issue. I also believe that change of government counterplans are rarely competitive and generally are not supported by the weight of real-world evidence.

3. PLEASE BE CLEAR. All debaters over-estimate the degree to which they speak clearly. I encourage you to slow down and make sure that I can understand you. If I am having trouble, I will frown or put my pen down or throw up my hands. If this happens and you do not slow down, you will get very bad points. I also want you to clearly explain your links (to both disadvantages and advantages). Don't just read a generic link card (free speech equals x). Read the card and explain the link to me. I also should note that if you explain your positions cogently and speak clearly, you will get very good points. I call this the Chrissy Mahoney corollary.

4. Theory debates are usually dull. Don't argue about theory unless you have a very good reason (the value or lack thereof of the judicial paradigm for instance).

5. Please be polite and pleasant. Debate should be fun. If you are rude in any way, I will give you awful points. Do not be rude or pushy after the round. I will be happy to discuss the round (if the tournament allows it), but I will not tolerate rudeness. Judging is hard work. Most "bad decisions" can be traced to the failure of the debaters to make things clear, rather than to bias or stupidity on the part of the judge.

6. Evidence. Please read qualifications. Why should I care what Smith in 83 said? Some sources are better than others. Gus Hall is not a very good source on socialism (or anything else for that matter). Source diversity is good. Three cards from a total of three sources is better than ten cards from one source.

Marty Sadler
7 Years Coaching

Houston Baptist Univ.
13 Tournaments

I have said many times that I believe the judge is a fully participating member of the debate round. I still maintain that position. Briefly, this view of the role of the debate judge suggests that in any debate the judge will evaluate, interpret, and render judgement on arguments presented -- judges will even make mistakes. The point is that judges should take on an ethic of fairness as a guiding principle for their judgements. Insofar as the judge plays a significant role in the outcome of any given debate, it is incumbent on a judge to seek out the reasons for decision from a perspective that gives each team a fair chance of winning. I do not say that this is an easy way to judge debates. On the contrary, from this perspective, a judge simultaneously acts as educator and arbiter, and it is frequently difficult to juggle those two roles. My efforts to cope with this dilemma have met with mixed results. I admit that I find it very difficult to vote for a team on the strength of arguments that I feel are useless or irrelevant (poorly developed topicality arguments and disadvantages with imaginary links fall into this category). I have, however, voted solely on the basis of such arguments -- it is a rare occurrence, but it does happen. Ordinarily, these decisions make me feel uncomfortable about the trends in this activity, but these decisions are created when opposing teams accept these useless arguments as valuable and try to debate them out. My warning is this: the following items are strong predispositions, but only predispositions. I can be forced out of them.

I believe that this topic requires an affirmative team to specify a federal court ruling which designates the freedom as a "first amendment freedom." In my mind, this area of free speech/press is a member of the defined object class in the topic. Any restriction on that freedom which is maintained by the court (or another federal court) would then qualify as an "established restriction." In my view, the restriction does not constitute "a restriction on first amendment freedoms" until such time as the court says that it is (the court upholding the restriction should also either recognize the first amendment nature, or ignore a lower court's designation that this is a first amendment freedom). Any action taken to remove or limit the restriction would consitute a topical plan action. Teams who run fifth or fourteenth amendment counterplans to make "trivialization" unique should notice that I would consider these as topical plans given my "object class" view of the topic construction. Additionally, even if "freedoms" is a 'mass noun' (and I have my doubts) I'm likely to look at the term as an object class -- if the mass noun is affected in a topical direction, it is affected in its entirety. Speaking of direction, I am highly unlikely to vote negative on the dreaded "on" topicality argument. Finally, if you see this as lenient for affirmatives, you are probably right. I have rarely voted neg on topicality this season.

Counterplans have been a fairly popular strategy this year. I believe that counterplans should be non-topical, and should reasonably 'force a choice' when compared to an affirmative plan. Agent or implementation counterplans are likely to seem topical to me. To compete, a counterplan should meet two tests: (1) are the essential elements of the plan/counterplan relevant to one another; and (2) do these essential elements intrinsically conflict with one another (usually, this means that in any permutation, or intrinsicness condition, the two plans would remain in an increment of disadvantage to one another). I have voted negative on the strength of counterplans more frequently than on topicality this year.

I strongly prefer a "card debate," where both teams have researched their positions and are applying them to each others' arguments. I prefer to vote negative on disadvantages. Speed and Subterfuge are not desirable substitutes for Clarity and Strategy.

Stylistically, I reward comprehensibility and professionalism. Humor is desirable, hostility is frowned on. Cross examination should involve only myself and two debaters. Try to de-tense. I'm happy to answer more specific questions.

Name: Darrell W. Scott Institution: Gonzaga Univ.

Position: Director of Debate Years of Coaching: 11

Number of Tournaments judged at this year: 7

Decision making paradigm: I am a debate coach trying to decide, from an analytical viewpoint, who did the better debating. Usually this involves assessing arguments in terms of policy analysis, sometimes judicial, but I rarely am willing to role play as if my decision is a legislative or judicial decision with concommitant time advantages, fiat powers, etc. I enjoy arguments that make sense, am significantly influenced by the quality of evidence presented, and tend to be annoyed by arguments that have purely strategic and no substantive value.

Topicality: I have always enjoyed topicality arguments, but haven't heard a good one yet this year. If you plan on dropping the topicality in rebuttles no matter what, then please don't run them. If your topicality argument is being won, please don't drop it, because I will vote on it.

Counterplans: I have always preferred heads-up confrontation on issues directly pertinent to the case, but recognized that given the direction things have gone, it has become nearly impossible. Counter-plans, therefore are fine as long as they really do raise some important issue. If they are on their face, purely strategic devices, I begin looking for reasons why you are losing the debate.

Add-ons/turns/disco: Add-ons are fine if they are not simply a postponement of the affirmative thesis until 2ac. Turns are fine, but after about two successive turns on the same argument, I think the analysis too tenuated to vote on. Superficial turns are given superficial attention on my ballot.

Style: I applaud debaters who demonstrate that they have a brain, who engage my intellect, and who act like decent folk who would be interesting to talk with after the round. If you act like you are so good that you can win while showing little respect for opponents, common sense, or the rules of rational inference, I will prove you wrong.

District judging philosophy: Scott Segal, University of Texas
Number of years: first as coach, but wise beyond years
Number of rounds: 50+ (more than can recall)

Substance

You found me! I'm one of the last remaining tabula rasa judges. I prefer to let the debaters do the debating---particularly when the issue at hand is some type of theoretical disputation. In theory debates, application is far more important than underlying paradigmatic supports. In other words, intrinsicness and permutations are better debated as mechanisms to improve the debate than as some type of evil talismans recalling hypo-testing. Remember, paradigm wars went out with leisure suits.

Will he intervene? Hmmmmm. I won't publish any lists of likes or dislikes. I am notoriously liberal. However, if left soley to my own devices in the evaluation of competing scenarios (DA's v. AD's), I will indeed make a decision. Given no giudelines, I opt for likliehood as determined by number of inferential leaps and specificity of scenario as the critical element in the calculus. Of course, time frame and ultimate impact, as well as value-based criteria, are more than acceptable.

What does he really hate? Generic DA's are fine. I H A T E contradictory positions, though. I'm even less fond of failing to point out contradictions. I will lower points and humiliate you after the round if given half the chance.

Topicality. Yes. Good T debates can be enlightening. Bad ones can be boring. Do your best and I will vote on T.

Ultimate thoughts. The only exclusion from the above announced t-r position is any tactic that impacts adversely on the fairness of the process. By that I mean theory "voters" must be grounded upon direct consequences, or damage done, to the present round. I'm pretty much hostile to anti-intellectual theory complaints or arbitrary calls for punishment.

Style

Believe it or not, I believe this component of debate to be on an equal par with evidence and technical proficiency. Let's face it: I can justify a decision virtually any way I choose. Taking that as a given, being unclear will almost automatically lose you the argument in question. I'm not just whining here. I mean it. If the point is important, slow down. Don't be scared of humor or drama because of your own sexual self-doubts. Don't just debate---convince! If you think I'm leading you astray, watch the top teams at any tournament and ask yourself (honestly) why they are where they are! Oh yes, if you do do this, you'll maximize the first rule of debate as well---you'll have fun!

NDT JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

NAME: Taishen Siao INSTITUTION: Wake Forest University
POSITION: Graduate Assistant YEARS OF COACHING: 1
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS SEASON: 7 (38 rounds total)

I. PARADIGMS: After all, it is the debaters who are debating. Thus, it will be up to them to assume argumentative responsibilities. If you want to be judged in a paradigm, tell me how. Otherwise, I am just an evaluator of argumentation AND strategy. Whoever does the better debating will win the debate. Punishment paradigms are fine, but considering the implications in the debates, they must be clearly justified. There are two minimum standards of arguments; (1) Presentation with clarity and comprehension, (2) Reasoning with explanation and justification. Aesthetically, please number your arguments so that you can refrain from saying "number next.." all the time. Sources should be qualified when they are read for the first time. Case attacks and disadvantages that provide on point evidence for links will be favored upon over generic meatballs. The negative position that provides a time frame analysis on DA's would be favored. Otherwise, I would give some more leeway to the affirmative's uniqueness evidence. Theoretical counterplans (e.g. Hermeneutics) and other issues that are not often debated this year should be explained better. Besides that, all issues are debatable and are worthy of consideration. The only exception is counterwarrants (even in desparation).

II. TOPICALITY: Topicality is a voting issue unless otherwise argued. I prefer contextual definitions over dictionary definitions. I do not find mass noun arguments very persuasive on this topic, or any other. Extratopicality is fine, but the delineation must be made between what should be in the resolution and what should not. Please provide standards for T and explain why your definition meet them.

III. COUNTERPLANS: CP's should prove at least to be either mutually exclusive or net beneficial. Conditional CP's should specify the condition(s) they are conditional upon. Topicality defintions in support of CP's should be consistent with other topicality arguments. Topical CP's will assume a greater burden to prove competition without shadow of a doubt. Permutations are legitimate tests of competition. Explain them well if you are serious about arguing them later. I am most receptive to CP's that prove an advantage to not having the affirmative plan, not just proving the merits of having the CP alone (e.g. Ban 1st Amed. CP should justify rejection of aff plan before justifying the total benefits of banning the 1st altogether). Debate about CP theory should be focused on competition between each other.

IV. ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: These strategies are perfectly legitimate if they meet certain standards. They should include an explanation of the rationale behind the argument. New arguments in rebuttals are only legitimate as to answer shifts from previous arguments (e.g. new links to DA's or new T arguments).

V. STYLE: If necessary for clarification, evidence will be read after the debate. C-X's are part of the debate and the answers are binding. But arguments may not be made in C-X., make them in your next speech. Speed is no problem on my flow as long as it is reasonably comprehensible. If you provide a long and elaborate roadmap, tell me before you begin. Evidentiary challenges are serious accusations. If either the challenger or the challenged loses, they will lose with zero points. Refrain from being rude, sexist, or condescending. Respect those involved in a debate by avoiding the use of profanity at all times.

1986 Statement

Doug Sigel Dartmouth College
Assistant Coach, judged at 11 tournaments prior to districts, 1st year coach.

Paradigm: Hypothesis testing best meets the goals of debate because it focuses clash on essential arguments and promotes creativity. Arguments that conditionality are bad are extremely unpersuasive to me; they are whines to cover up poor case selection. Debate only works, however, when arguments are well developed and proven. I tend to ignore arguments which lack enough substance to be taken seriously. Counterintuitive arguments, for example, require more detail and evidence than arguments which make sense on their face. I frequently find myself "intervening" to resolve many bad debates because there is a lack of argument development. I will vote for ANYTHING if you defend your assumptions and coherently define your position. I do not subscribe to "Rowlandism" because debaters are my intellectual equal; I have no axe to grind and no ambitions to fiat my views on the debaters. If you have worked hard to develop creative arguments I should AT LEAST LISTEN. The way to check abusive practices, I believe, is to allow debaters to argue that abusive tactics should be a voting issue. Punishment arguments are fine; the DEBATERS--not the judge--should determine what is acceptable in a debate. It's your activity; it's just a job for the coaches..

Style: Junk spread and failure to extend arguments will hurt you: very little of your speech will make it on to my flow sheet and even less of it will factor in my decision. The clearer you are the more likely I am to agree with you. I give low points to debaters who fail to use cross-ex properly; asking for evidence irritates me a great deal. High points go to debaters who approach the round intellectually; the assumptions behind positions should be defended with good evidence.

Counterplans: I frequently vote negative on exceptions counterplans. The argument that they are illegitimate because they collapse topicality & competition burdens makes NO sense at all. Permutations are grossly abused in most debates; permutations must retain topical action and there ought to be evidential support for their effectiveness. I don't even bother to flow many one-line permutation arguments. I also believe that political trade-oof can be legitimate proof of competition; the argument that fiat removes the political incompatability of two policies doesn't persuade me. Counterplans should be nontopical but with broad or directionless topics I accept topical counterplans.

Misc: Counterwarrents, especially on a vague topic like this one, make no sense. Disco is fine IF BEFORE 2AR: I can always give a good enough 3NR to justify voting neg. when the 2AR discos. Addone/turns are fine if they are substantive and are really independent of the rest of the arguments.

My opinion of recent petty rules for NDT: Debate is dying because we have too many rules imposed on us. The real problem is poorly written topics; we need better topic selection not more rules. I predict a return of evidence misuse once we can't look at evidence. How can anyone ethically support the no reading of evidence rules? I rarely read evidence but on occasion it is necessary.

Topicality: I rarely vote on it. This topic is fairly broad but that is the wording committee's fault. Most negative arguments tend to arbitrarily pick one definition from among many. THe best way to argue T is from a field context perspective. If there is no expert support for topicality I tend to vote negayive. Extratopicality is no big deal because I believe in severability. THere can be cases, however, when the extratopical provision's severability so changes the focus of the round that the negative should win.

Decisions: When appropriate I will provide all the feedback you want; don't threaten me physically If I vote against you.

Bill Slagle, Mercer University

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I will adopt any decision making paradigm on which the debaters in the round agree. If left to my own devices, I prefer the policymaking mode. I am not opposed to theory argument, but I do think theory positions should be explained as opposed to "tagged." The only time I consciously "intervene" is when debaters force me to do so by failing to access voting issues.

TOPICALITY: I personally think topicality is a voting issue, however I have at times disregarded it when the negative has dropped an affirmative position arguing that it should not be a voting issue. The philosophy form asks how I determine the "better" definition. I don't, the debaters do, just as they determine the "better" argument for or against adopting the resolution.

COUNTERPLANS: Counterplans are fine; they can be useful as alternatives to resolutional action, as an alternate policy position, and as simple justification arguments. As with any argument a team advances, permutations should be explained; I think the explanatory burden on permutations is on the affirmative to justify why they can permute as opposed to the negative's having to justify why the affirmative cannot permute. Study counterplans and counterwarrants are okay with me if teams want to argue them.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: Add-ons and turnarounds are acceptable (as are most positions teams choose to argue) as long as they are explained. I expect affirmative "turn" responses to be "turns," and I expect their evidence to support the "turn tag." Discoing is okay, too, so long as the positions are clear. I think many debaters make the mistake of assuming that their judges are able to see why their arguments turn a disadvantage, why their case gets a particular add-on, or why their position shifts are legitimate. Debaters should realize that they know their arguments better than their judges, and that if a judge fails to understand a position, the fault probably lies with the explanation or lack of it.

STYLE: Rules permitting, I will read evidence after a round if I think there is a question of my understanding it. Speed is okay as long as I can understand the words--some debaters can be very fast and clear, others cannot. If I can't understand the words, I can't flow the argument. I react to political movement/consciousness DA's as I do to any other argument in the round. I do think these disadvantages are susceptible to time frame arguments, assuming the affirmative is able to indicate realistic time frame positions that stop the disad. I think CX answers should be binding. I am totally unimpressed with obvious evasions and refusals to answer relevant questions. I don't mean that a debater should have to give away future positions, but I think relevant questions should be answered. I think the examiner should be given significant latitude to make assumptions for the opposing team who was given a chance in CX to clarify a position and chose not to do so. I am not "into" punishment, but I am into rewards in terms of speaker points.

Ross Smith, Wake Forest University, 5 yrs. coaching

NOTE: THIS IS A NEW STATEMENT, NOT A REPEAT. It consists of a list of items not subject to debate in the round:

Topicality is a voting issue

Competitive counterplans must provide reason(s) to reject the topical action(s) proposed by the affirmative. A permutation that demonstrates that the best policy is a combination of topical action from the affirmative plan plus parts or all of the counterplan is a reason to vote affirmative. A non-competitive counterplan that solves the disadvantages to the affirmative plan does not exit the debate merely because the negative team wishes it to. A winning counterplan is one that proves that having adopted the counterplan, a policy maker would not wish to adopt the affirmative plan. Each mutually exclusive plank of the counterplan must be proven to be a superior alternative to that which it excludes.

Presently means currently, not imminently.

The affirmative does not have to prove that the restrictions they curtail or prohibit "support" freedom of speech.

Counterwarrants are illegitimate.

If new links or impacts to a disad are given in 2NC or if links or impacts are provided for the first time in 2NC, the affirmative may shift its position on the disad, and give new arguments in 1AR. The same goes for new competitiveness arguments from the 2NC. New arguments in 1NR are illegitimate, but 2AC add-ons may be answered for the first time in 1NR.

Fiat powerful enough to overcome the many things that entrench the status quo seems powerful enough to overcome like effects of the affirmative plan. If the negative can fiat past the transition, then the effects of the affirmative on delaying or disrupting the transition are irrelevant. In a post-transition analysis, the negative must prove that the increment of damage to a fully established authoritarian or socialist world outweighs the increment of advantage the affirmative plan may have in that world.

Fiat is limited to U.S. governmental bodies.

Minor repairs to disads must be clearly specified as to the action taken and proven solvent. They may be argued to be illegitimate for other reasons, but this is a minimum requirement.

If the affirmative is willing to defend its plan without severing anything, then extratopical plan planks are legitimate. Otherwise, their legitimacy is debatable.

Arguments must consist of both a claim and a reason to accept the claim.

Quoting someone as saying something that they conclude to be wrong in the same article is unethical and deserves a loss, as do other forms of fabricating or distorting evidence.

Speakers must be comprehensible.

Tag-team c-x is ok. I don't read much ev. when arguments (see definition, above) aren't made about the ev. or when which ev. is most important is not specified.

AUGUSTANA
COLLEGE

David Snowball, Director of Debate
Years coaching: nine Tournaments this year: six

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: Generally, I make policies. Generally, those policies do not include: WOMP, socialism or anarchy.

TOPICALITY: Topicality is a voting issue, to argue otherwise is a waste of time. I have been reasonably liberal on topicality this year since most of the T debates have come down to "**establish**" and most negatives have not done much to explain why the "make firm" definitions are unacceptable.

COUNTERPLANS: I haven't heard many this year. Generally, I do not think they are competitive. In order to be competitive, I feel that the counterplan must present an inherent reason to reject the affirmative and that this issue is best decided by comparing plan advantages and counterplan advantages. The operative question is whether or not accruing the plan's advantages necessarily causes us to lose the counterplan's advantages. If there is no necessary conflict, I think the affirmative should win. This means that banning the affirmative as part of a larger counterplan is illegitimate unless the ban is essential to creating the counterplan's advantage.

STYLE: I am increasingly punitive on comprehensibility issues--I will no longer ask for evidence whose content I cuuld not catch because of articulation problems nor will I vote on arguments whose explanation I could not comprehend. Several affirmatives have lost this year because the 1AR was a bunch of half-understood taglines.

DISADVANTAGE LINKS: I thought I should add this section since I keep voting against disadvantages when I think that there is effectively zero risk of their occurrence. One chance in a million is, for me, the same as saying no chance at all; hence, it does you very little good to run an apocalyptic impact on purely speculative links. On the negative, you can buy some credibility for your links by explaining them and by keeping the impact scenario within the bounds of reason (e.g., an impact which the authors of the link evidence might accept). If you are going to claim Russian Revolution as the impact, you better have very good links.

WAYS TO GET ME TO DETEST YOU: I generally like debaters (even my own) and enjoy their company. There are, however, a number of things that you can do to get me severely irritated:

A. Be rude and/or condescending: I **hate** rude debaters. We are all members of an academic community whose continued existence depends, in part, on our ability to behave civilly. Rudeness weakens these bonds of civility and leads to unpleasant rounds.
B. Fake evidence: I am absolutely rigid on the subject of evidence falsification and I'm in a particularly bad mood because, in the course of preparing for Districts, we found a disturbing number of cards taken out-of-context.

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION
AND THEATRE ARTS
ROCK ISLAND ILLINOIS 61201

Roger Solt, University of Kentucky
11 years coaching; 12 1986-87 tournaments attended

General Concept of Debate: I think of academic debate both as a strategic game and as an attempt to provide intelligent discussion of substantive questions of public policy. Debate's intellectual and competitive values require balancing, but current judging practices seem to overly emphasize strategy over substance. In line with this perception, I find myself voting with less and less frequency on what I perceive to be cheap shots, and I am increasingly attempting to reward what I see as intellectual substance in argument.

Decision Criteria: While I attempt to be open to any well-reasoned theoretical construct, I do not pretend to be tabula rasa where theory is concerned. I will impose a relatively heavy presumption against theoretical positions which I regard as fundamentally misguided--intrinsicness of disadvantages, counterwarrants, justification and punishment arguments provide some examples. I have yet to hear a substantive policy position which I would dismiss out of hand; however, the reasoning and evidence provided in support of a position are always open to critical scrutiny, and the weight which I will ultimately assign a position is colored by my perception of these factors. Underdeveloped positions start out with a lower level of credibility in my mind, even prior to an opponent's attack. And I am likely to discount the impact of flagrant overclaims to a level I see as consistent with the reasoning and evidence provided.

Risk: I continue to view debates in a highly probabilistic mode. This means that I rarely regard significance, inherency, or solvency arguments as absolute (though I am willing to entertain arguments that a given case is too trivial in absolute terms to merit consideration). And I continue to vote on low probabilities of catastrophic scenarios. While I still believe that assessment of even low probabilities is essential to intelligent policy analysis, I think that in debate we systematically assign higher probabilities to catastrophic scenarios than their evidence or reasoning justify. No speculative doom scenarios are ever absolute, and questions of their relative probability seem far more important in specific time frames. Furthermore, the unique increment of a DA link is often orders of magnitude smaller than would be needed to trigger the impact, and where an affirmative can articulate why this is the case, I am quite willing to assign zero probability to a disadvantage. To paraphrase Jeff La Fave, "You don't cause a flood by spitting in the ocean." Some link arguments are absolute, but many are not, and affirmatives need to learn the difference. Given the vanishingly low significance claimed by many affirmatives, even very low probabilities of many DAs will be enough to outweigh. And even non-unique disadvantages will sometimes negate the underlying value of the case.

Topicality: I have voted on this issue less often this year than in years past, and I have found myself increasingly disinclined to vote for junk topicality unless it is very badly mishandled. I am relatively tabula rasa on topicality standards, and I frequently find that debate over standards is decisive to my resolution of the issue. (This assumes that there is debate over standards, not just a mutual spewing of tag lines.) Topicality remains a voting issue in virtually all situations, but various debatability considerations such as adequacy of prior notice legitimately influence the level of proof required to establish a plan as topical.

Counterplans: All legitimate competitiveness standards are ultimately reducible to net benefits. Acceptable permutations involve a combination of the entire affirmative plan with one or more physical or conceptual subcomponents of the counterplan. If the permutation is the optimal policy in the round, the judge can vote for it, thereby avoiding disadvantages. Negative fiat should be limited to domestic public actors. Topical counterplans are acceptable if they provide substantive policy clash. Conditionality is acceptable if not abused, the total number of independent negative positions being the prime consideration.

Presentation: Few debaters are as clear as they think they are, and I sincerely believe that enhanced presentational clarity would do more to improve the intellectual quality of debate than any other development I can conceive. However, for individual judges to not examine evidence strikes me as a singularly futile effort to promote this goal. I will read evidence, but will not give it weight in the round unless something on my flow allows me to verify that in fact a certain card was read. I intend in the future to give increasing weight to clarity in speaker point assignment.

1987 N.D.T. JUDGE PHILOSOPHY

WILLIAM SOUTHWORTH, Director of Debate, University of Redlands, 18 Years of Coaching, Judged at 13 Tournaments 1986-87

1.) DECISION MAKING PARADIGM. For the purposes of a seventy-two minute debate round I strongly believe that only two competing policies can adequately be compared. Whether the negative introduces one or ten "conditional arguments" the theory is bankrupt in lieu of the pragmatic limitations this activity functions under. The punishment for this theoretical atrocity is the loss of that argument from the policy comparison, no more no less. Policy making does imply that one look at the status-quo and the inherent risks associated with any change. I have found it amusing how under cross-examination how many affirmatives refuse to defend the premises behind the First Amendment, Free Speech or any other basic Constitutional Right. I do not find it persuasive to reverse established Constitutional Interpretations because we should be "cool to lawyers." The most minor articulation of negative presumption would be sufficient to warrant a negative ballot if this is the total affirmative claim. However, I also find it difficult to accept that by reversing a 5-4 Supreme Court Decision we are suddenly going to bring the Court tumbling down along with two-hundred years of established Democratic procedures. In other words, I do not find it persuasive to have "big impact harms" with "low level probability links" for either the affirmative or negative. In short, on this topic I consider the affirmative presumptive burden to be considerable when reversing 9-0 Supreme Court Decisions because the SOUTHWESTERN LAW REVIEW says the "court blew it!" Correspondingly, I consider it highly unlikely that any judicial reversal of say,allowing demonstrators to sleep in Lafyette Park,would suddenly rejuvenate the New Right; signal to the Soviets the final colapse of President Reagan's administration; or suggest to the Third World that the United States is truly a nation of Free People and thus they should encircle the Soviets!

2.) TOPICALITY: At this tournament, and always for me, a VOTING ISSUE which should be determined by the "Better Definition Standard." This particular topic is absurdly too broad, consequently negative interpretations which seek to focus the resolution have persuasive appeal to me. Simply because an affirmative has a card which uses their area and the words First Amendment, or Free Speech in the same context does not equate the two. The ultimate determinator of BETTER DEFINITION is often the standards which the negative uses to compare their evidencial definitions. If by excluding court cases which do not directly deal with "oral articulation of ideas" we narrow the range of affirmatives from 2,000 to 1,000 possible cases then within the debate context the negative definition is better. If, however, the affirmative case is non-topical and the negative evidence would produce one or two possible affirmative cases, then the negative is being too restrictive. Clearly all such standards are subjective, but all too often the debate revolves around equally obscure definitions and no one puts them into some comparative context. The affirmative plan, I might add, is limited to but required to, structurally implement the resolution. There is no such thing as an extra-topical advantage, only ET plan provisions which if proven ET should be excluded from comparison. To effectively provide for a comparison of policy systems the affirmative should have to defend an agent of implementation, whatever configuration they can establish and defend in light of "traditional" means.

3.) COUNTERPLANS. The negative may introduce as many competitive, non-topical counterplans they wish, however, they are committed to them just as the affirmative is committed to their example of the resolution and they better defend a consistent policy alternative. Topical, non-competitive or extra-competitive portions of counterplans are tossed out of the round! Most generic counterplans are not competitive. Only those portions which do in fact compete with the affirmative plan are legitimate. For example, a negative may argue that we should administer the affirmative plan with a socialistic or anarchistic agent and attempt to isolate advantages to that specific administration. Of course, they would not be allowed to change the entire governmental structure to accomplish this form of administration. Any affirmative plan which implemented such sweeping reforms would be argued to be 99% extra-topical and justifiably so, the counterplan must be a counterplan not an laternative resolution. The focus of debate for a policy maker is the affirmative example of the resolution. The topic serves to focus and divide ground, the negative has all other non-topical alternatives which structurally compete with the affirmative plan. This somewhat simple structural limitation seems like the easiest way of limiting both teams. Counterwarrants are simply another means of disguising hypothesis testing which is a way of introducing conditional argumentation all of which cannot logically function in a reasonable debate formate.

4.) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO. I believe he who introduces an argument is responsible for its ultimate disposition. Consequently if a negative team argues both extra-topicality and a disadvantage of a particular plan provision then that person risks having both granted and excluded from the round. The affirmative may choose to do this at any stage of the debate. Why should any team receive fair warning for their own stupidity? Now, whether or not something is a legitimate "add-on" or an entire new shift in the affirmative case; whether or not a 2AR "disco" has any semblence of merit based on 2AC/1AR "positions" is often very subjective and consequently "risky." All three strategies are usual fine, although often abused by both teams!

5.) STYLE, ETC. I somehow feel this section is irrelevant these days. I will not read any evidence after the round, I will not ask debaters to clarify what they said in a particular speech, I will evaluate only what I got down and what I understood. I flow cross-examination and consider it as important as any other speech. All arguments do not have to be rooted in an evidence card, and when comparing evidence I consider the source more important than the date or even the absolute wording of the card. I prefer evidence which explains its conclusion, and obviously evidence I can at least get the idea of. The difficulty is not so much words per minute but rather the amount of evidence which is read on each point. Better quality evidence would reduce the need for so much evidence and enable the same words per minute to be offering explanations not the more difficult to understand evidence reading. I believe the team nature of debate ends when the individual begins to speak, ask questions or give answers. If argued I would be receptive to excluding any argument which was given by (or coached by) a colleague during a speech or cross-x period. My preferences are clearly for more "rational" argumentation which is linked evidencially and analytically, just as obviously my preferences are rarely accommodated. This is an excellent topic area, and more debates than ususal have explored the judicial and constitutional reasoning behind many of the arguments and issues. If debaters would take a few moments to put issues in perspective they could just as easily include some logical challenges as well as the traditional laundry list of evidencial denials and challenges. Similarly, if debaters would attempt to use cross-examination for more than finding all the arguments they couldn't get down (but the judge was suppose to) to perhaps ask a debater to explain how or why and argument or piece of evidence makes any sense they might be surprised by the answer! I know I would be shocked by the question!

SUSAN STANFIELD
1 YEAR AS A COACH

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS: 12

TOPICALITY: I would like to see less time spent arguing standards and more time spent on the violations. I would prefer to see just a few violations run in a given round, however, if you insist on running multiple violations, they must work together as a consistent interpretation of the resolution. Topicality is always a voting issue.

COUNTERPLANS: I believe that mutual exclusivity and net benefits are the best standards for competition, however, I will listen to others. Permutations are only a test for competition and don't allow the affirmative to capture the counterplan. I don't have any problems with conditional arguments, however, if multiple counterplans are run I want a consistent policy to vote on by 2NR.

INHERENCY: Is yourplan the status quo? If not, you are inherent.

STYLE: Speed is not a problem; incomprehensibility is. If you are not understandable, I will not work to reconstruct what you argue.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is my first year as a judge, and I do not have a long list of biases, and I don't wish to impose restrictions on how the round will be debated. Anything I list here is a guide rather than a rule. Left to my own devices, I am a policy maker. I believe that the topic does not require an agent to be specified, however, for the purposes of answering disads etc., the affirmative needs to be consistent.

David L. Steinberg
Assistant Director of Debate
George Mason University
10 tournaments judged this year
9 years coaching

previous institutions: Auburn
University of Tennessee
Middle Tennessee State
Penn State

1. My thinking most closely resembles the hypothesis-testing paradigm. My focus is on the probable truth of the resolution as tested against other possible explanations. I view argument as conditional by its nature and I prefer that all arguments concern issues central to the resolution. I will not consider an argument that has not been fully developed, even absent response by the opposition. I often find that I do intervene due to debaters' failure to establish decision rules, emphasize key issues or provide direct clash. I have been most often persuaded this year by disadvantages which question the value or effect of protecting or expanding first amendment freedoms, least often by arguments about the agent of action. I do, however, view debate as a game and, as such, will consider any argument or paradigm that is defended persuasively. Finally, debate should be educational. I will vote to punish teams that abuse the educational value of the activity.

2. Topicality is always a voting issue, extratopicality often is. I think it is particularly important that the restriction discussed be one that has been judicially created. Better definitions to me are generally based on a legal context relevant to the first amendment and provide clear limits on the resolution (of course, these standards are debatable).

3. I have voted for counterplans fairly often this year. I prefer that they address the affirmative problem area and/or compete implicitly with the resolution. Weighing net benefits is often impossible absent these other standards. To me, permutations are a legitimate way of illustrating a lack of mutual exclusivity; I have not been persuaded by sequential permutations. Topical counterplans become rationale for the resolution. I find counterplans a very good way of testing the probable truth of the resolution, but too often they are offered only as mind goo and time suck.

4. Most NDT debate is too fast. I ignore incomprehensible speech and evidence. I rarely read evidence after a debate; I will not read what I could not understand. I will, in evaluating the relative merit of arguments, consider the source and qualifications of evidence. If these are not presented (i.e., "Smith in '86"), the evidence loses its value. Within District 7, most debaters I have heard this year spend too much time on the negative attacking the case; at "national" tournaments, negatives spend too little time on case. While plan arguments tend to carry more weight, the traditional stock issues should not be ignored. I sincerely hope you will enjoy the debate. If I didn't enjoy the activity, I wouldn't be here. Please be kind and considerate to one another and to me; this should be a pleasant experience. Feel free to approach me if you have any other questions.

1987 N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

Name: Jenny L. Steinen Institution: University of Pennsylvania

Position: Director of Debate Years of Coaching: 3

Number of Tournaments Judged This Year: 7

1. DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: If the debaters fail to set up a paradigm in the round, I will use a hybrid of Stock Issues and Policy Making to make my decision. I will vote on any stock issue, a disad that outweighs case significance or PMA that takes out Aff. advantages. Every argument must be prima facie. Although my prima facie standards are low, I will drop a case if it is not prima facie, whether or not it is argued as such in the round. That is the extent to which I will intervene in the round. Finally, I do expect both affirmatives and negatives to defend a consistent position.

2. TOPICALITY: I expect the debaters to set up the standards for this argument, but it is always an a priori voting issue. Absent any standards to evaluate topicality, I will use reasonability. Extra-topicality is a voting issue only if Aff. solvency depends on the E.T. plan plank.

3. COUNTERPLANS: I accept counterplans as a legitimate negative position. However, they must be non-topical, competitive (in terms of mutual exclusivity, net benefits or philosophy), and presented in 1N. Since I expect both sides to present a consistent position, I do not accept conditional counterplans. The negative also loses presumption. I dislike generic, philosophical counterplans (i.e. ban First Amendment, Socialism,...).

4. ADD-ONS, TURNS and DISCOS: Add-ons are OK as long as they are prima facie, and turns are legitimate too, though rarely independent voting issues. Discos are thrown out if they create an inconsistent policy for either side.

5. STYLE, etc.: Speed is fine as long as the speaker is comprehensible. I intensely dislike "meatball DA's", like Malthus, Beef,.... I use the same standards to evaluate Aff. ads. and neg. DA's. That is, if the Aff. advantage is incremental, the DA may be incremental as well. I will read evidence only if it is contested during the round. I like to hear debaters chrystallize and weigh issues for me in rebuttals. Clarity and persuasion will be rewarded with good speaker points.

FRED STEINHAGEN CONCORDIA COLLEGE

GENERAL FRAMEWORK. My present judging philosophy would be termed that of an "educational gamesman." The "educational" reflects my desire for the outcome of the process. The "gamesman" term reflects my view that the educational end result is best served by allowing argument about any issue. I promise to listen (to the best of my ability) to anything. Since education is my desired end result of the game, educational implication is one fruitful area from which to develop justifications for theoretic practices. It is certainly not the only area from which to develop such justifications. "Gamesman" has been purposely used in preference to "tabula rasa" since it is hard for me to believe a blank slate possible or even desirable. What does a blank slate tell the tab room if no one develops any decision rules? The predispositions which I knowingly bring into a room fall into 4 general categories.

PARADIGM PRECONCEPTIONS. When placed within the hypothesis testing, policy making or stock issues paradigm, I will automatically weigh presumption in the appropriate manner at the end of the round. This does not mean debaters can or should not influence that weighing. Violations of burdens created by the paradigm must be pointed out. The following section details some burdens which will automatically be accepted as flowing from the paradigm in the absence of contrary argumentation. If a different paradigm or some variant of the paradigm is argued, implications should be clearly developed as flowing from the paradigm. If no paradigm position is argued, I will function as a weak hypothesis tester. "Weak" indicates that the presumption weighed against the resolution is rather weak. It is assumed terms of the resolution need to be justified, counterplans need be nontopical and disadvantages should be intrinsic. When functioning as a policy maker it is possible the lack of a coherent and consistent policy may be enough to cause me to vote against the offending team. Presumption will be against the risk engendered by change and relative to the amount of change. Other standards for presumption are certainly possible when argued and won. It is an unusually incompetent affirmative that selects a harm area so insignificant that it will not outweigh presumption. Consequently, when making policy it is hard for me to vote on presumption alone without disad risk unless presumption is shown to be particularly severe. When evaluating stock issues, conditional argumentation is appropriate, presumption is with the present system and counterplans must be mutually exclusive. This list of the implications of paradigms is certainly not exhaustive.

ARGUMENT PRECONCEPTIONS. My view is that education is best served by promoting rigor in argumentation through minimizing judge intervention. A vigorous attempt will be made to hold the debaters to what they argue without the benefit of judge interjected applications or explanation. Probably the most important result is a conscious effort to hold debaters to the argumentative claims that they actually make. What you say outloud is the argument made. Even if I could make the argument more effective by altering the claim, it will not be rewritten for you. You should also make your own applications of arguments. If an argument on disad 1 applies to disad 3, you need to tell my why. Even if the link is "clearly" the same. You need to tell me that. Weighing positions is also your obligation. Winning an argument isn't that hard. Ability to show why the arguments you've won are important to the whole round is the mark of a truly good debater. Intervention will happen after 2AR. I will make a real effort to catch new arguments in 2AR. A lot new happens in 2AR and it is automtically thrown out. While a smart disco can strike me as a thing of true beauty, it is risky to grant things out in 2AR since that will probably be perceived as new. Comparisons of positions are pretty safe. In another effort to minimize intervention, I try to call for evidence only if it was missed through my error or if there is a dispute about the nature of the evidence. (Sometimes I do call for evidence out of idle curiosity. Don't worry about the effect on the decision).

TOPICALITY PRECONCEPTIONS. At the start of the round topicality is an absolute voting issue, extratopicality means no accruing advantages. Again, all this can be fruitfully argued.

OTHER PREDISPOSITIONS. Don't be obnoxious. This would never be consciously applied to a decision but I don't like it and anyone who knows anything about selective perception knows our conscious intent is suspect. Playing with the format of the activity should be argued only as a last resort. This view of gamesmanship does not thrill me. It would take a lot of educational benefit to outweigh the impact upon the poor tournament director. When in doubt - ASK!! I am more than willing to elaborate on this rather brief outline.

Ken Strange — Dartmouth College

Judged at 12 tournaments — Coached for 13 long years

I vote for teams who do a good job of resolving arguments and issues, teams who explain why they have won a particular argument and why that argument is important in the debate. Explanation and analysis are much more important to my decisions than cards; in rebuttals you should tell a good story rather than read more cards.

I would prefer that you ignore what I say here on theory issues. There are several reasons for this. First, I will try to decide theory issues as they are debated. Second, I would prefer not to have to decide theory issues. They are often irresolvable. More importantly, if you depend on theory to win, you are diverting attention from substantive issues, which are educationally more valuable. Third, you should not prostitute youself. If you believe a theory position, then argue it persuasively and do not sell out. Finally, most theory issues are too complex and subtle to explain adequately on one page.

Paradigm: I believe debate is better if each team takes a policy position and defends it throughout the debate. In this context, conditional policies are illegitimate. My minimum standard for an argument is that it make sense; that is, that I understand what the argument is and what impact it has. Beyond this minimum, arguments become comparative. As far as my reaction to popular disadvantages is concerned (this is a paradigm question, Walter ?), I do believe that beyond a certain point the probability of a DA becomes so low as to deserve to be treated as zero. Whether the DA is dismissed as having no link usually turns on how good are the stories told in 2NR and 2AR.

Topicality: This is a voter. Extratopicality takes out the advantage derived from the non-topical provisions. For reasons that relate to my biases on conditionality, I do not beleive that non-topical planks drop out; they stay in, can be the basis for a DA, but cannot be the basis for an advantage. I usually decide topicality based on reasonability of the affirmative definitions; it is the negative burden to prove the affirmative's interpretation unreasonable because of limits, debatability, grammar, etc.

Counterplans: Mutual exclusivity and net benefit are the competition standards. Structural and logical permutations are legitimate; illegitimate are intrinsic permutations, ones drawing on policies that are part of neither the plan nor CP. I tend to believe that counterplans must be reasonably non-topical, but I am not firmly committed to this view. Again because of my views on conditionality, I believe that counterplans which fail competition or topicality burdens are reasons for voting affirmative. An illegitimate counterplan leaves the negative with no policy. To allow them to revert to the SQ is tantamount to allowing conditionality. The differences between a non-competitive CP and a DA without a unique link are too numerous to list here. Counterwarrants are illegitimate. We do not debate generalizations; we debate resolutions which are provable by a single example and not disproven by example.

Add-ons, etc Sure. Why not ?

West Georgia College

Carrollton, Georgia 30118

A SENIOR COLLEGE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

David Svaldi WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE, 15 years exp.; too many tournaments this year.

As much as I hate to admit it I tend to the tabula rasa view of debates. I do agree with most of Rowland's indictments of this judging philosophy, but I am unsure how to implement other criteria without becoming too subjective. I will attempt to judge debates based upon the paradigm established by the debaters in the round. I do have a few biases: first, an argument should consist of at least two parts, a clear label and an explanation. This does not mean that 1AR must orate to prove his/her point but cryptic labels are not arguments if I do not understand their original intent. Second, 1AR may grant out arguments but 2AR is too late for any gross shifts in Aff thesis and philosophy. It equals a new argument in my book. Third, 2NC is too late for any c-plan unless called for by a complete change in Aff case thesis between 1AC and 2AC. Fourth if I am to vote on a T argument, it must have evidence and be explained. If 1AR misses an independent T argument hidden in a solvency attack, I probably will not hold it against them. I very seldom vote on topicality and this year is no exception. I would prefer a round with lots of clash on substantive issues (cards), deciding whether conditionality is a reason to "punish" some debater is not my idea of fun. Finally, if you want to guarantee yourself low points, be abrasive and obnoxious, demand to know the decision after the round and question my decision or competance. I may not get you before the fact, but I will the next time.

I guess counterplans have become a fact of life in debate. Its pretty hard for the negative to win without one. Generally, for a c-plan to be competitive, it should force choice between the neg and aff. Standards of mutual exclusivity or net benefit both force choice so they are OK. Other standards are lists but I will resolve them based upon the arguments made in the round. Obviously permutations that are acceptable must be based upon the arguments made. I do not like to dismiss huge chunks of negative argument because of permutations but such dismissal will probably improve c-plans and c-plan theory in the long run. Such permutations must be at least as clearly explained as the c-plan. I think topical c-plans probably just go away, if Aff lets neg get by with this. Hasty generalization is a good CEDA argument and thus, by definition, a bad NDT argument.

In 1986, there are no arguments I prefer to hear over others. I hate to vote for the New Right argument but have done so almost every time the negative has chosen to extend it. I guess I will read evidence if a challenge is made but most of the time, I have decided how I will vote prior to any evidence reading anyway. See my comments in my critique of last year's final round at NDT for further information.

I would prefer to judge debates that are enjoyable. Everybody takes this activity much too seriously. By this I do not mean that laziness and lack of preparation are justified if you entertain me in a round. I do mean that many other things are more important than the outcome of a specific round of debate or a specific tournament. I will reward cleverness and humor with better points assuming you debate well. Good luck but have fun.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY INSTITUTION

Ted W. Urban
Henry Ford Community College

Director of Debate 11 years/coaching
Tournaments this year = 7

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM--I have always considered myself a stock issues judge. However, I will adapt to whatever paradigm is most comfortable for the debaters. In any paradigm, I prefer the debaters (particularly 2NR and 2AR) determine the voting issues in the round. In the event they do not, I will "intervene" to whatever degree necessary to resolve "dangling issues." PRESUMPTION always rests against the resolution. SIGNIFICANCE is an important issue. Affirmatives must show some level of real or potential harm in their constructive arguments. SOLVENCY means that the affirmative team must show some degree of advantage exists at the end of the round. INHERENCY seems to be imbedded in the resolution this year (the restriction is the barrier).

TOPICALITY--As topicality arguments have been used as "alternatives to case arguments," I have tended to vote less and less on topicality. As a result, I treat it as another issue in the round. However, topicality is the only absolute issue; if negatives win it that is all they need to win to gain my ballot. But so long as the affirmative presents a "reasonable" definition, that is the "better" definition.

EXTRATOPICALITY--is not an absolute issue. If some portion of the affirmative advantage is shown to stem from a nontopical plank, the plank may be severed with some loss of solvency, but affirmative teams may still win the round.

COUNTERPLANS must be nontopical and competitive. Competitiveness means 1)that because both plan and counterplan achieve the same advantage and/or 2) that both cannot be adopted. If a counterplan is shown to be topical, the debaters should instruct me on its disposition, otherwise I simply ignore it.

ADD ONS/TURNAROUNDS--These are perfectly legitimate strategies. Add ons must meet the same criteria as other advantages. Evidence and an explanation should accompany the "turnaround" claim.

STYLE--I have two concerns: 1) Rudeness is uncalled for, 2) willful misrepresentation of evidence is grounds for disqualification.

GENERALLY I am favorably disposed to teams who present well-reasoned and well-evidenced arguments.

Judging Philosophy: Cary Voss, Baylor University

I am basically a policy maker. I compare the policies advocated by each team at the end of the round to determine the better policy option. The only issues not open for debate are time limits and speech order.

Topicality: I feel is always a voting issue, but should still be defended by the negative in the round, the rational being important in evaluating the argument. Standards are useful in comparing arguments and definitions, but are not voting issues of themselves. Better definition standard is my preference, with the implications of the interpretation on the resolution being the determing factor in deciding which definitions are better. 2NC topicality is ok, but I dislike topicality arguments as time wasters. Make sure you explain your topicality arguments. I will listen to X-topicality arguments, with the implication being argued by debators in the round. I consider myself liberal for affirmative on topicality.

Counterplans: Must be non-topical and competitive. Topical counterplans are additional warrents for the resolution. On competition, I feel mutual exclusivity and net benefits are the only true standards, but will listen to and vote for other standards if they are won. 2NC counterplans are really only legitimate to address 2AC addons or turns, and I will probably give the affirmative more leeway in answering them. Conditional counterplans are ok, but the evidence stays in the round and can be captured by the affirmative. I will also listen to conditionality bad positions. Counterplans should have evidence or explainations that support them, and should be well developed and defended. I am pretty strick on negative on competition, and will listen to permutation arguments and attacks of them.

Stock Issues: I use significance to weigh against disads. Qualitative and quantative is fine with me, but tell me how to weigh any comparison in the round. Inherency is necessary, but easily attainable. I feel that unless the affirmative plan has been passed, the case is probably inherent. Solvency arguments are important in assessing significance, but almost no meet-needs are absolute. Absent a disadvantage, the affirmative will probably win, not counting topicality arguments or counterplans.

Turns/Addons: are ok by me. They become additional significance to weigh against disads/counterplans. Probabilities of scenarios, timeframes, and links need to be argued and evaluated by the debaters in the round. If you don't do it, I will to come to a decision applying my own criteria.

Misc.: I dislike justification arguments - they are counterplans with no guts. Speed is ok,comprehensibility is key. I can't vote on arguments I can't hear or understand. I will call for cards for clarification, but most evidence evaluation should be make by debators in the round. Fabbed evidence will result in round loss and zero points; flippant challenges risk the same penalty. Win a disad, counterplan, or T and you will win my ballot. 1AC should be scripted and pleasant. Personal attacks, blatant arrogance, or rude behavior will result in points adjustment. Be professional and make the round enjoyable for everyone.

Melissa Wade
Director of Forensics, Emory University
14 years coaching, 5 NDT tournaments

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I prefer the games paradigm as an umbrella paradigm. Among the more traditional paradigms, I prefer policy making. I dislike the punishment paradigm as I find punishment more appropriately determined by the judge (after logical flaws in theory have been indicated by the debaters) and meted out through speaker points reduction. I do not believe it to be a supportable reason for decision in an issues-oriented debate round. I frequently intervene in debate rounds at the invitation of debaters who do not instruct me how to evaluate their positions in the round. If one fails to tie things together, in my opinion, one deserves the creative approach of the judge to reach any decision at all.

TOPICALITY: I am still, after all these years, very liberal on topicality as long as the affirmative position is reasonable. I believe that significant education occurs when debaters are allowed to be creative within reasonable parameters. Successful extratopicality arguments result in removing parts of the advantage from final consideration. They are not absolute. Affirmative carries a presumption in topicality in my view and I leave standards of "better" definitions to the debaters.

COUNTERPLANS: Aren't selling on this topic very well, but if you have one it should meet the traditional burdens of competition and advantage at a minimum. With appropriate defense, topicality is not as critical.

GENERAL REACTIONS: While I appreciate the creativity of counter-intuitive positions, I feel that a strong burden of proof accompanies such a strategy. Please be warned that I will not flow or evaluate evidence or arguments that are incomprehensible. I expect explanations of arguments. Tag lines which require my significant addition of subject and verb are invitations to me to intervene. I feel debaters anticipate judge intervention while decrying it. If the judge chooses to intervene in the wrong way (from the viewpoint of at least one of the teams) they are no longer "reliable." Perhaps we need debater's "philosophy sheets." I feel that this topic has taken many by suprise. Counterplans and big generic "end the world" disadvantages are difficult to link. Affirmative strategy has been to adopt microscopic advantages that link to nothing and meet no traditional theory burdens of significance and inherency (that dreaded ancient notion). Perhaps debaters don't know how to debate "the old way"--which is too bad because this topic can probably <u>only</u> be debated that way (if one defines debate as clash.) One can simply say this was an "unchallenging topic" or one can try to make it challenging. On a final note, please use good research citations. Your authors qualifications to speak matter on all topics!

1987 NDT JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Gregg Walker
The University of Utah

8 years college coaching
10 tournaments this year

I am a critic of argument. I will evaluate a debate from whatever paradigm the debaters explicitly or implicitly advance. Regardless of the paradigm dominant in the round, I expect debaters to meet minimum standards for argument. I will not vote on something that lacks argumentative validity, even if dropped by the opponents. Valid arguments are understandable claims supported by appropriate data. Overclaimed evidence often nullifies an argument. I tend to intervene against assertions that lack sufficient clarity, reasoning, and evidence. I strive to be an impartial and open minded critic of argument, but I do bring some biases into debate rounds. If you are interested in those, read on.

TOPICALITY: Even though many arguments on any topic get dredged up from the past, I see value in debating a different resolution annually. I will vote on topicality, although I have not done so much this year. Some of the "establish," "restriction," and "freedoms" violations have not been terribly compelling. Debaters have also not argued topicality very well this year. If I perceive a negative running the argument as a "time suck" I may give the affirmative leeway on other issues.

COUNTERPLANS: Whether worldly, anarachistic, conditional, socialistic, hermeneutic, traditional, matrixed, or convoluted, counterplans should be nontopical and competitive. Debaters determine the appropriate competitive standards although I react negatively (often for the affirmative) to a laundry list "blip" of standards. Mutual exclusivity and net benefits make the most sense. Counterplans have the same policy burdens as affirmative plans (e.g., solvency, implementation). Counterplans that compete with the resolution rather than the specific plan (e.g., socialism) seem more vulnerable to permutations. Counterplans need advantages (do more than just make disadvantages unique). Affirmatives should consider arguments against the counterplan (e.g., fiat abuse, transition, disads, solvency). I enjoy counterwarrants in CEDA.

ADD-ONS, TURNS, FLIPS, DISCO: With so many claims tagged "flips" this year, I often feel like I am at a gymnastics meet rather than a debate tournament. Flips or turns on plan or case should be genuine and explained, at least if debaters want me to vote on them. I am amazed at the number of blurred or blipped "flips" debaters claim in any given round, few of which are self evident. If debaters perceive a double-turn they should argue it . . . they may win the round on it. Specific rounds justify cross-application and severing tactics. If the negative advances a "dump the file box" or "spew chunk" spread strategy I am likely to give the affirmative, particularly the poor 1AR, leeway.

IMPORTANT MISCELLANEOUS RAMBLINGS: Concerning **plan arguments**: Negative teams are better off with disadvantages than without them. I prefer DAs that are applied. Links, linearity, uniqueness, and threshold claims should be clear and come out before 2NR. The greater the DA "skeleton" in 1NC (e.g., nuclear war from sleeping in the park in three easy steps), the greater the leeway I give the affirmative later. I prefer quality to quantity of response. Absolute solvency arguments can alone warrant a decision. I will **call for evidence**, though rarely a lot of it. I like to flow evidence cites and content. If I have trouble doing either, I blame the debaters. **Speed** should be strategic and not sacrifice clarity. I will not vote on incomprehensible arguments. I prefer numbers and good **organization** to "number next" or "next argument." I am receptive to **1AC underviews** if they help focus the debate. I will vote on conditionality. I listen to theory arguments and real decision rules. On **punishment**: for many debaters, seeing me in the back of the room is punishment enough. I think the wording of the resolution legitimizes small cases, disadvantages with small risk, and negative positions without a lot of specific case evidence (although I like it when I hear it). I like the topic area this year much more than the resolution. I have seen more bad than good debates on this topic. Surprise me with a good one.

1984 Statement

NAME: John Wallen
SCHOOL: Claremont McKenna College
YEARS OF COACHING: 17

1.DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: Academic debate is a process for training students in oral argument. I see my role to be that of a judge-critic who evaluates students' abilities to generate, support, and refute and defend an exchange of argument between competing teams, operating within time constraints, and using a resolution to reasonably limit the bounds of the controversy. Because the primary value of academic debate is educational, the ultimate criterion for acceptance or rejection of a given paradigm of evaluation is its pedagogical value. Thus, I grant great latitude to the debaters to establish the standards of judging in a given round because it is a good test of their ability to argue; but I will vote against a team that falsifies or distorts evidence, regardless of their reason for doing so, because I consider such practices antithetical to sound educational practice. I am inclined to believe that academic debate best serves the student if its format (and unwritten rules as well) provides an approximately equal opportunity for the affirmative or negative to win through its arguments.
With the caveat that I am not very bound to my intuitive responses to the issues below, the following predispositions influence my evaluation of rounds:

2. TOPICALITY: Topicality can definitively be a voting issue. The best topicality arguments not only establish standards for evaluating "T" and alleged violations of those standards, they also establish a hierarchy of standards so that standards may be evaluated against competing standards in the round. I have voted for "all waste," "past injuries," "disposal-dispersal," "product-byproduct," "and legal responsibility for disposal rather than injury."

3. COUNTERPLANS: On counterplans, I am not fond of conditionality but have voted for conditional counterplans when negative arguments have been better than affirmative arguments on this issue. The type (ie formal cause) of counterplan can best be justified through non-topicality, competitiveness, and comparative significance. I have been known to see topicality of the "CP" as an affirmative voting issue rather than merely an excuse to jetison the counterplan. I believe the competitiveness issue answers the question: why should the CP be considered a substitute for the affirmative plan in this round? I believe traditional (I.E.,mutual exclusivity, net benefits, etc.) and non-traditional competitiveness arguments should try to answer this question. I am usually appalled by counterwarrants, believing among other things that the negative soes not have the right to write a bad plan for the affirmative.

4. ADD-ONS & TURNS: T & A are playing an increasing role in the outcome of debates and I am not bucking this trend. You should include a (debatable) decision-rule on double turns. I expect that 1AR turns will be genuine turns (i.e., link or impact), and not merely add-ons.

5. STYLE: I expect debaters to conduct themselves with a businesslike decorum (perhaps even good-naturedly) and have been known to point-punish participants who evade unreasonably in C-X, are surly or rude, or meet standards of evidence integrity. I believe that only this sort of feedback will "educate" debaters toward appropriate behaviors.

NDT STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME-- Ron Wastyn INSTITUTION-- Wake Forest University
POSITION-- Assistant Debate Coach Years of Coaching-- 2
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR-- 5

1) DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM. The process that I use to decide debate issues does not fall into a neat category. I begin with a minimum standard of argument. An argument must consist of a claim followed by a reason to accept this claim. Labels are not arguments. To decide the round, I employ a criteria that requires teams to force choice between alternatives. Affirmatives must provide clear reasons why to reject the status quo and the negative must provide reasons to reject the affirmative. I leave it up to the debaters to figure out the best means avaliable to accomplish this. Most things are debatable in front of me. I do require that all issues be explained. Do not assume that I have heard every argument known to mankind. Each round of debate is unique, just because I may have voted for a position in the past does not mean that I will vote for it again. This does not mean that I do not have preferences, I do and will explain them in the rest of this philosophy.

2) TOPICALITY. I believe that topicality is a voting issue. I have not heard any good arguments against this position and I believe if topicality ever lost this special status then debate will be on its last leg. I do have a preference for topicality arguments that are logical. For example arguing that presently means "in the future" is not logical and not persuasive.

3) COUNTERPLANS. A counterplan must force choice between the affirmative and the negative. Mutual exclusivity seems to be subsumed by net benefits. I believe net benefits is the only competition standards that forces choice between alternatives. Resolutional, philosophical and resource competition do not force choice between alternatives. Permutations are fine because they demonstrate that there may not be forced choice between alternatives. I do require that permutations be presented in constructives. Topical counterplans are fine if they force choice.

4) ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO. All are fine by me, given that time is allowed for response by the opposing team.

5) STYLE. I am increasingly becoming tired of being yelled at. Please make every effort to have an enjoyable debate. Nasty debaters receive nasty points and their credibility lowers as well. Comprehensibility is mandatory if you want me to understand what you are saying. I could care less who answers cross-ex questions, if you need help from your partner get it, this saves confusion later. Debate is an activity to have fun at as well as to be competitive, please do not let the competitive nature ruin your fun or make you into an unpleasant person.

Mark Wayda, Director of Debate, Ohio State University, Third year of coaching. 10 tournaments this year. More rounds than I care to think about.

Overall, I am pretty fucking tired of these philosophies. The only reason people read them is to find out if they can do what they wnat. If not, they think the judge is stupid and do what they want anyway. My beliefs are that I do not have the right to impose my views on the debate round. In some instances, such heinous abuses occur that I have no choice, but my ad hoc intervention is rare. I am predominantly, for better or worse, a blank slate.

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM: I prefer to compare policies. I will compare multiple conditional policies. Many things qualify as policies. The status quo is a policy. Surrender is a policy. Socialism is a policy. Anarchy is a policy. Referendums are a policy. First strike is a policy, and so on. The affirmative is a policy. Several different affirmatives are several different policies. Justification aregurments are not a policy. In spite of this preference, will vote on virtually anything. I votred this year on justification arguments (one round) and on countervalues. Do what you want, but do it clearly.

TOPICALITY: I'm fairly liberal. In spite of NDT normative guidelines, it is or isn't a voter. It's purpuse, in my mind is to focus the debate (i.e. debatability). Prior notice — as in, "We've been running this case all year and they debated it 17 times" — makes some sense to me, although there are answers to that position. I hate "restriction must be ina court decision" topicality. It seems to say that if a court ruled that something is not a first amendment right, we assume it should be, leading to like Kings College's "catspeak," case based on the fact that the court rule that the constitution only applies to humans. But I am apparently one of only three people in America who feel that way.

COUNTERPLANS: I like counterplanns. I like agent/system change counterplans, and I detest the movement to "outlaw" the or write them out of the resolution. Competition should include some indication that the affirmative cuts against the establishemnt of the coutnerplan (i.e. state action cuts against anarchy). I'll listen to permutations, but there should be some reason to do them other than they allow the affirmative to get out of the counterplan. In other words, there should be a net benefit to the permutation, and negatives should be prepared to argue there is a net benefit against the permutation. Permutations are tests, but if you want to argue they are adopted and that it lets you captur the counterplan (or, that it lets the negaitve capture the plan) I'll listen. Couterplans should be competetive. I'l presume counterplans should be non-topical untill I'm told they don't have to be. I'll vote eityher way.

AD-ONS, ETC: Sure. Be smart and defend it.

STYLE: I'm tired of judges saying they won't vote on an argument they didn't get. If a 2n spends 45 seconds "getting" answers missed from the 2ac, and reads six cards to answer #4, which I didn't get in the first place, I will consider #4 in the round just like the 2n did. There is undoubtedly a point at which I will say "I didn't get it, and I'm not going to vote on it," but it is highly unlikely that I am going to dismiss arguments because a debater says "if you didn't get it, don't vote on it." More than anything, I am likely to give some leeway in rebuttals to re-answering those positions. I would caution, however, that when a 2ac makes 5 answers to a disad in the first 30 seconds of a speech, I have a less-clear idea of what the debate is. The quality of argument also seems to be declining. I am disturbed by the "on below, he says not true, but it is, also, our cards say yes..." instead of more fully explained positions. Simple signposting slao seems to be ignored in many of the debates I see. I prefer numbers or at least "number next" for each arguments, as well as some clear indication of the argument being answered. I'm starting to hear "on below...also, not true...also..." It is very hard to follow, and in spite of my willingness to search for meaning in a debate, you risk a more arbitrary decision. I also think lnr must start doing a better job of extending their case evidence. When a 2ac can blow through 15 cards in 35 seconds (not an exageration) there is probably some argument the lnr can get some milage on.

PERSONAL NOTES: I see debate as an information processing exercise. As such, the comparison of information (both evidence and argument) is the focus of the debate. I'll read cards. I will accept arguments that evidence is overclaimed, misapplied, or just plain horrible, but you better give reasons. Evidence challenges should be made cautiously. Evidence should not be fabbed. I detest "punishment" issues. "Tag team" cross-x is better than getting the wrong answer. Having input into a partners speech is also fine with me. If a debater is doing something his/her partne doesn't like, the partner should say something. If you are in the middle of a speech and drop briefs or can't find something and need some time to look, ask for prep time. It is your time to use as you wish, and if you don't want to waste speech time looking for a card, that's fine with me. Finally, if you have questions, see how my teams debate. They should be attempting to embody the philosophy of debate I espouse (or I will hurt them) because I believe the activity must be changed by coaching, not judging. If people don't like the activity or the way people debate, clean up their own acts. Don't expect judges to take that responsibility. If you still have questions, ask my debaters — they know what types of arguments I like. If that doesn't help, ask me, and I'll tell you in essence, "Do what you want."

JOE WILLMORE DIR. OF DEBATE, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Paradigm: I tend to view myself as an informed citizen considering policy alternatives in an imperfect world. I find most paradigm argumentation a waste of time. I also don't think debate is a very good way to determine "truth" (whatever that is!). I very reluctantly vote on punishment. I am strongly predisposed against conditionality.

Topicality: Usually I'm a "T" hack but I'm not sure I've voted on it this year. The more lines of "T" you run, the less credibility I tend to give it. I am willing to treat "ET" as an absolute voter if argued as such. "T" is always a voter and I can't think of an instance where I treated it as a reverse voter this year. I find little sympathy for aff. counterstandards such as "free speech" or "more educational".

Resolving Substantive Issues:

A) Counterplans: these seem pretty much a waste on this topic. However, I think it is extremely wise to counterplan out aff. advantages (like CIA Covert Ops or invasion scenarios). Fiat has limitations--it is not an answer for me to compliance or implementation problems with socialism or anarchy. I tend to be receptive to "replanning" and have voted on many a permutation this year. One hint--it is not sufficient to say "well, we could permute!". The permutation must be specified. Conditional counterplans must be announced as such in 1NC. My version of "mixed scanning" doesn't allow more than 2 counterplans per round. Forget counterwarrants or "No New Cases at NDT" arguments.

B) DisAd links: unfortunately for most negatives, I am increasingly finding most DA links on this topic less and less persuasive. "Linearity" and "risk outweighs" also seem like fairly distasteful means of resolving arguments--regardless of how big the impact is. At some point, the increment of risk/link is so superficial I can't consider it.

C) Add-ons/Turns: if it outweighs, I vote on it. An intelligent teams is always making strategic concessions. By the way, while arguments may drop out of the round, evidence always stays in to be used by any side as they see fit.

D) Case Argumentation; at this point, it might seem like I am one helluva affirmative hack on this topic. Actually, I've been going negative 40% of the time. On what? For once, we have a topic where case argumentation can win alot of rounds. I find that most of these cases that dodge DA links with advantages with "equity" or "truth" to have so little significance that almost anything will outweigh (like counter-value positions). Additionally, values are rarely absolute values. Thus, I can agree that knowledge is good without concluding that more knowledge is therefore desireable. Finally, I don't find alot of these "minimalist significance" cases very compelling when an alternative means of providing the information or access is available.

1987 NDT STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

George Ziegelmueller
Director of Forensics
Wayne State University
Years of Coaching 29
Number of Tournaments Judged This Year: 5

1. Decision Making Paradigm. In general, I prefer to be a stock issues judge, although I inevitably weigh the impact of the disadvantages against the case impact in making final decisions. I believe that as a general rule debaters establish the paradigm by mutual consent during the course of a round and I am willing to judge the debate according to whatever paradigm is negotiated. I try to avoid intervening in the debate round but when debaters fail to resolve issues adequately, I will do it for them.

2. Topicality. It does not seem to me that topicality has been a major issue in most rounds of debate on this topic. For me, topicality is always a voting issue and I determine what is the better definition according to the standards negotiated in the round.

3. Counterplans. Counterplans may be competitive by being mutually exclusive or by virtue of net benefits. Counterplans must be non-topical by the same standards that the affirmative plan is topical. I have heard very few counterplans used on this year's topic and those that I have heard used have not been very effective.

4. Add-Ons/Turnarounds/Disco. All of these are legitimate strategies if they are not carried too far. Add-ons should be developed in constructives and meet the normal standards of significance, inherency and solvency. Turnarounds should be more than blips. They should not be simply re-statements of the case advantage and they should not contradict the original affirmative analysis.

5. Style. I still believe that debate is an oral communication activity and that there should be reasonable standards of good presentation. I recognize that speed is an inevitable part of the debate process and I don't object to it as long as the debaters remain comprehensible. Debaters should avoid talking to their feet, sitting on the back of chairs and generally being hot-doggish or obnoxious.

1984 Statement

Tod Woodbury — Wake/Fla St Law
Nine years judging — Georgetown guest

I think of myself when judging (and other times) as a blank slate on which the arguments and extensions are chalked. Without attempting to justify tabula rasa in a single page, it works best, and seems fairest, for me to avoid, as much as possible, putting my own opinions into the debate. In practice, this view of judging tends to produce the following in rounds I adjudicate.

1. I value speaking ability; not 'persuasion' in a more traditional sense -- I like speakers who are fast, intelligible, and answer all of the extensions on an argument they intend to win. I write very fast, but decreased speed is fine if made up for by quality argument and careful use of language.

2. I like debaters who minimize my discretion. The most frustrating (and speaker point costing) thing I see debaters do is to not balance & weigh opposing advantages. This incites overclaiming, but is clearly preferable to me deciding which of two 'advantages' each ending the world, is larger, sooner, or 'takes out' the other. I abhor 'muddled' debates.

3. Debate is a game, albeit an important one. Thus, within time constraints, all bets are off. All decision rules and traditional concepts' resolution (inherency, significance, etc.) are hopefully enunciated explicitly and resolved largely by the debaters. Also, since debate is a game, fairness is the ultimate criteria. For example, presumption and presumption of topicality do not exist until explained in the debate.

4. The one exception to the above is courtesy and ethics. I feel free to impose my own severe penalties on debaters who forget for any length of time that debate is a game. "Out-of-context" and similar claims make all other issues irrelevant; one side or the other loses.

5. Random personal notes: 1. Arguments should be additive (i.e., inherency may take out disadvantages). 2. Conditional counterplans are fine, but I question whether they violate an advocacy burden. 3. I can't think of many rounds where topicality standards mattered much in the end. A violation, is. 4. I like fast, fun, intelligent debates in which applications of blocs to specific arguments are made. 5. The only area of the topic I don't feel I have as good a grasp of as most debaters are related to specific, in-depth foreign policy arguments from last year's topic, on which I judged infrequently. 6. I think good (=tricky) cross-examinations can affect the outcome of most debates. Asking for cards usually wastes these opportunities.

1986 Statement

N.D.T. STANDARD JUDGE PHILOSOPHY FORM

NAME: Bradley P. Ziff INSTITUTION: Georgetown University

POSITION: Public Affairs Officer, Natl. Academy of Engineering YEARS OF COACHING: 11

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED THIS YEAR: 10

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM

I believe that debate is a comparison of two competing policy systems, whereas at the end of the debate, I prefer to weigh the advantages of the affirmative proposal against the disadvantages, alternative policy systems, or concommitant mix. I dislike debates that focus on theory , and have, on occasion voted against negative teams for alleged "abuse" positions on conditionality, hypothesis testing, etc. I do not like to intervene at the end of rounds (rarely, if ever have done so), and typically restrict my evaluation to precisely what is argued in the round--not potential extensions that could have been made, etc. I never have voted on any type of "punishment paradigm"--, though, as noted above, I will accept a well defended, and poorly answered argument on the illegitmacy of multiple policy options by the negative.

TOPICALITY

It's no particular secret of the circuit that I have, and continue to be awfully liberal on topicality. I am not fond of debates that are mired in a myriad of one line topicality arguments that are blown up in rebuttals . Topicality arguments need to be well developed; I prefer contextual as opposed to dictionary definitions; I find "better" or "best definition" the most likely standard to vote negative on. No one term in the resolution has troubled me during the year on this issue. In sum, I don't generally vote on topicality; I dislike lots of quibbling over grammar, and for the most part, it's not a good issue for the negative to put the whole round on. New cases at the NDT are fine. I might also add, where in the the few instances that I have voted negative on topicality, it has been when the negative has concentrated on this issue; explained it clearly, and defended it throughout the round.

COUNTERPLANS

Through training, not enjoyment, I have become a better judge for counterplans. Generally, mutual exclusivity is the best competitiveness standard for me; net benefits are fine, especially on exception counterplans. Redundancy and Philosophical competitiveness rank somewhat lower and are tougher for me to vote on alone, if the other's are lost. Generic counterplans are fine--though, it is helpful for the negative to generate specific evidence linked to the case being debated. I'm not very good for socialism (or when it returns, World Government), though I've voted for them on numerous occasions. I dislike counter-warrants on this or any other topic--the affirmative needs to say very little to win this argument.

STYLE/GENERAL

Turnarounds and add-on's are fine. Disco's also acceptable--preferred in IAR--I'm a little more skeptical in last rebuttal. I read,selectively, evidence at the end of the debate, but not when it's the debaters fault when speaking incomprehensibly and not to totally re-create the round. I'm very wary of shifts or re-definition of positions in the 2AR. I've been judging alot for long enough that most people know that I attempt to just compute what happens at the end of the round without any real significant biases.